DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 910 CG 015 127

AUTHOR	Healy, Charles C.; Sorenson, A. Garth
TITLE	Career Counseling Task Forces: A Staff Development Project to Create Educator Teams for High Schools and Community Colleges in California.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	19-30049-39504
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	94p.; For related document, see CG 015 128.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Development; *Career Guidance; Goal Orientation; High Schools; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *School Personnel; *Staff Development; *Teacher Improvement; *Teamwork; Two Year Colleges; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	California; *Task Force Approach

ABSTRACT

This report describes five workshops conducted throughout California to enable educators from high schools and community colleges to coalesce into career guidance task forces for their schools and to learn about current career guidance concepts and practices. Activities and personnel who supported the project are presented according to their functional role. Project objectives are enumerated and achievements resulting from the project are assessed in terms of team development, technical learning and satisfaction, attendance, and personal growth. In the Technical Learning and Satisfaction section of this report, the workshop activities are detailed in a day-by-day summary. Participant evaluations of each workshop and its modules are presented by overall workshop ratings and by individual module ratings, as well as the authors' impressions about the evaluations. Project experiences are delineated and recommendations for improving staff development are suggested, including: (1) allowing sufficient time to create and refine a staff development program; (2) providing a flexible array of integrated staff development services; and (3) assuring that participating teams accept mutual responsibility for progress with the program originators. (Author/NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201910

CAREER COUNSELING TASK FORCES:
A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT TO CREATE EDUCATOR TEAMS FOR HIGH SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA

University of California - Los Angeles

Charles C. Healy, Co-Principal Investigator

A. Garth Sorenson, Co-Principal Investigator

U. C. Regents

Project Number 19-30049-39504

June 1, 1979-June 30, 1980

CG 015127

This activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles C. Healy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	1
Project Activities	2
Restatement of Project Objectives	14
Accomplishments	17
Discrepancies from Project Goals	49
Improved Teaching	55
Participant Summary Form	59
Dissemination	64
Recommendations	74
Appendix A	77
Appendix B	79
Appendix C	88

* * * * * *

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Advisory Committee for Career Counseling Task Forces Workshop 8

Figure 2 - Special Consultants/Presenters Who Contributed at Several Sites 9

Figure 3 - Contributors to Workshops 10, 11

List of Tables

Table 1 - Los Angeles Participants' Overall Satisfaction (Frequencies) 21

Table 2 - Willingness of Los Angeles Workshop Participants to Try Workshop Ideas and Activities. 22, 23

Table 3 - Participant Evaluations for Selected Los Angeles Presentations 24

Table 4 - Particpant Statements for the Most HIghly Attended Los Angeles Smorgasbord Sessions on December 8, 1979 . . . . . 28, 29

Table 5 - Los Angeles Participant Reactions to Field Visits 30

Table 6 - Percentage of Respondents Willing to Try Ideas from the Spring Workshops 34, 35

Table 7 - Percentage of Respondents Satisfied with Different Aspects of the Spring Workshops 38

Table 8 - Reactions to Selected Presentations in Spring Workshops . . 39

Table 9 - Summary of Member Characteristics 62

ABSTRACT

This project provided instruction designed to help high school and college educators launch and/or improve interdisciplinary career guidance programs. It recruited and serviced more than 220 California educators from 56 schools and colleges.

The evaluations given to our staff indicated that the participants were satisfied with the overall instructional program and intended to try out its many ideas and practices. Our observations and team reports indicated that a substantial majority of teams progressed in becoming task forces, but that few moved as far or as rapidly as had been hoped.

Experience in the project showed some of the difficulties of educators at the high school and college collaborating in ongoing teams to achieve a general interdisciplinary goal such as career development, and it suggested ways of improving staff development for such collaboration. Our report delineates our experience and recommendations for improving staff development. The three most important recommendations admonish allowing enough time to create and refine a staff development program, providing a flexible array of integrated staff development services, and assuring that participating teams accept as much responsibility for progressing as the program originators.

This report adhres to the outline required by the State of California for Projects funded under PL 94-482 or PL 95-40, Title II, Part A, Supart 3 and Supart 5 Ancillary. For clarity there had to be slight repetition of Accomplishments and Discrepancies parts of the report in the Internal Evaluation part.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES

The major activities of this project were five workshops designed to enable educators from a school to coalesce into career guidance task forces for their schools and to teach them current career guidance concepts and practices. The workshop activities are detailed in the technical learning and satisfaction section of the Acommplishments part of the report on pages 17-48. Since the workshop elements were targeted at particular objectives, a clear, comprehensive picture of the workshop can best be portrayed economically by combining the description of the workshop components with their evaluations. This part of the report describes the activities and personnel who supported the project under the headings Recruitment, Administration, Coordination, Advisory Committee, Contributors, Material Development and Consulting.

Recruitment

We began recruiting in mid June, 1979 after the Advisory Committee recommended locating three workshops in Southern California, one in the Fresno area, and one in the Sacramento area. With the help of the Advisory Committee, letters of invitation to participate in the workshop were sent to presidents and deans of students of all the community colleges and to principals (a copy letter to their superintendents) of two hundred high schools in the Los Angeles County area. The letter announced an orientation for late August at either of two times. This letter brought representatives of 28 schools/college to the orientation, and their reaction assured the project staff of the need for the project and general interest. A follow-up letter was sent scheduling another orientation on September 18th because many educators were on vacation in mid August. It brought an additional 23 school representatives.

Our orientation was for administrative and/or the school career education officers. In it Drs. Healy and Quinn reviewed the project objectives, discussed the rationale of task forces, and facilitated a discussion of the problems which the schools/colleges believed they had in career guidance. The two Los Angeles meetings elicited commitments to the fall workshop from 26 teams, of which 22 eventually participated. Three community colleges cancelled at the last minute because of inability to interest their counselors in the program, and one team never appeared.

Dr. Healy had to take charge of recruiting outside Los Angeles and decided upon an alternate Southern California site in mid-October because of staff

delays in identifying and communicating with site coordinators. After agreements were made with selected coordinators, he sent recruitment letters to community college presidents and deans of students and to all high school principals in the Fresno, Orange County and Sacramento areas. He and Dr. Markert offered orientation meetings in Fresno and Orange in early December, and he did one in Sacramento in mid-January. The Sacramento orientation occurred in January to enable Dr. Shel Weissman to personally recruit. Only the well informed and motivated potential participants attended.

The invitation letter and group orientation were the primary recruiting vehicles because the authors learned that large conferences of principals, superintendents, presidents and deans were not meeting in time for recruitment through them, and the staff had not expected to solicit participants. To support the letter, site coordinators in Fresno and Orange Counties assisted in recruiting with follow-up calls and endorsement, and Dr. Weissman in Sacramento engaged in an extensive mail/telephone solicitation. News releases were placed in the county and national Counselor Association Newsletter, but they did not draw one participant. In addition, Dr. Healy visited a Los Angeles City Schools exemplary guidance center and talked with numerous City School officials and high school counselors, trying to enlist Los Angeles City School participation, but without success. Since Los Angeles City would not participate, the spring Southern California workshop was scheduled for Orange County. Dr. Healy also solicited advice from local school superintendents and telephoned Orange County superintendents and principals during December and January. Since extensive recruiting drew Dr. Healy's attention from other project concerns, future projects should include provision for commissioning a specialist with marketing skills and school contacts for these duties.

Administration

Operating a project from UCLA requires attention to many rules and regulations. In a temporary project like this, there are many difficulties to be anticipated, especially difficulties in hiring desired personnel and in securing accessible office and instructional space. Budgeting procedures are complicated, and a project administrator typically lacks verification of expenditures until at least 50 days after they are made. Payments for good and services and requisitions of instructional materials require advanced notice, different specialized form, and elaborate handling. Seldom can transactions be completed as quickly as in a small district. Ms. Linda Gibboney and Ms. Claire Malis of UCLA Extension fortunately helped considerably in our working with the overall

University. Our project had predicatable administrative problems, starting with inability to hire the intended coordinator, unavailability of the desired working space, confusions about instructional space, difficulties in requisitions, and late payments for services.

Our project also had some organizational problems. Everyone was not always sure about position responsibilities or about the quality of performance expected. This clearly stemmed from the fact that the project entailed temporary duties in relatively novel positions for most of the staff under rushed circumstances. Normally, a new work unit has a shake-down period in which to establish and refine operating procedures, enable learning of position duties, and permit clarification of responsibilities. The thirteen-month duration of this project did not accommodate a "shake-down" period, and its absence put a strain on our operation. Although the staff were or had been the professors' students, new role relationships for service to others needed to be established in order to expedite work, and such learning should be expected to take as much time as establishment of any new working relationship.

The very structure of the staff positions thwarted smooth operation. Seeking a range of expertise for the multifaceted program as well as a group who appreciated the project orientation on career guidance, we opted for part-time teaching assistant positions rather than half the number of full-time positions. This provided four staffers who were already acquainted and knowledgeable about our direction, but relatively inexperienced in inservice. The mutliple staff increased communication problems when shifts in operation were necessary, and their student obligations sometimes reduced assignment flexibility. The coordinator position was intended to be full time, but the inability of the University to award an adjunct title to a person without extensive research publication thwarted our hiring of the desired candidate. This necessitated Dr. Healy assuming more leadership responsibility, especially when a 60% appointment suited our next choice in coordinator candidates. After the untimely departure of Dr. Quinn, the first coordinator, Dr. Louis Markert who was a former project assistant, became coordinator at 100%. However, except for the summer of 1979, he was and remained the only 100% employee.

Staff Assignments

The per cent of time commitments and roles of the staff during the project were as follows:

Coprincipal Investigator	Dr. Healy	100% summer, 1979 and 50% academic year
Coprincipal Investigator	Dr. Sorenson	66% summer, 1979 and 20% academic vear
Coordinator	Dr. Quinn	60% July-November, 1979
Coordinator	Dr. Markert	100% December, 1979-June, 1980
Assistants	Mr. Markert	50% September-November 1979
	Ms. Guy	100% June-September, 1979; 49% September, 1979-June, 1980
	Ms. Yen	49% September, 1979-June, 1980
	Mr. Sorensen	49% October, 1979-June, 1980
Secretary	Ms. Lees	50% June, 1979-June, 1980
	Ms. Mathenges	50% September, 1979-January, 1980

The project required a great amount of staff effort and flexibility as well as travel. Staff willingness to persevere in spite of time pressures and changing demands accounts for the project's success. Staff efforts are enumerated here.

All senior staff instructed, consulted with teams, and evaluated formatively, and all assistants aided instruction, consulted with task forces, collected, prepared and collated data. Dr. Healy managed ongoing administration, recruiting, and advisory committee liaison. Dr. Sorenson and he shared responsibility for decision making about instructional direction and evaluation. Although they composed the final and intermediate reports themselves, Ms. Yen and Dr. Markert assisted by organizing data and preparing descriptions of the workshops. Dr. Sorenson did extensive material development and formative evaluation with assistance from Ms. Guy. She also took charge of assembling and controlling instructional materials after Dr. Quinn's departure. Ms. Yen oversaw overall data collection and processing, and she and Dr. Healy composed the rating forms and questions used to evaluate the workshop and its elements. Dr. Markert assumed Dr. Quinn's responsibilities for arrangements and liaison with coordinators and guest presenters, and he assisted with staff assignments and supervision. He, Mr. Drew Sorensen, and Dr. Healy maintained ongoing liaison with teams. Moreover, in the early stages of the project, then Mr. Markert, Mr. Sorensen, Ms. Guy, and Ms. Yen searched the counseling literature for validated career counseling practices for special populations and rural dwellers, but unfortunately they found it almost barren. Midway through the project when the need became evident, Mr. Drew Sorensen assembled more than 100 exemplary career infusion lessons.

Finally, but perhaps of most importance, Ms. Lees was the faithful, untiring secretary. She typed manuscripts and completed and corrected staff

correspondence, kept track of all materials, cajoled printers into quick production, wrestled with a myriad of bureaucratic forms, made travel arrangements, and managed telephone communication.

A longer project duration and/or a more permanent inservice unit would permit smoother organization and management. Better defined and consistent roles would have increased productivity and would have reduced the tension. Nevertheless, the staff's perseverance and dedication enabled the project to provide the instruction it proposed at a level fitting for a UCLA based-operation.

Coordination

The project enlisted three site coordinators to assist in delivering the workshops in different parts of California. Moreover, the project commissioned two locally prominent consultants to facilitate localizing the workshop.

Coordinators are key persons in the operation of a multi-site effort that entails regional individualization of instruction. They furnish current background information about needs and capabilities of the participants which are vital to tailoring a program properly. They provide entree to local influence leaders and guidance in proper protocol. Often they become the hub of a network which will sustain an innovative program such as task force career guidance. Ideally the coordinator will be a person who takes and is given sufficient responsibility to assure local ownership in a workshop.

These contributions are what is hoped for from a coordinator, although in our project and others, more mundane, yet still important, functions are specified as the coordinator duties. We, for instance, had coordinators secure facilities for the recruiting orientation, act as local agents, arrange workshop facilities, recommend local presenters, and recruit local panelists for the community interface panel.

Our coordinators, Mr. Howard Atamian in Fresno, Mr. Jim Curley in Orange County and Dr. Shel Weissman in Sacramento, performed very ably. The professionalism of Mr. Atamian was not less than inspirational. When we were having difficulty in recruiting in Fresno, he provided crucial leads and made solicitations which enabled us to enlist participants. Moreover, recognizing that we weren't able to cover job search techniques and sexual and racial bias fully in our reduced program, he recruited an exceptional cross section of community people who managed to cover these areas, while interacting in the spirit of the community panel. In addition, Mr. Atamian graciously assisted in consulting with teams and alerting us to particular needs throughout the workshop.

Our major mistake with regard to coordination was underbudgeting. Mr. Atamian and Mr. Curley in Orange County were unpaid. Fortunately, Dr. Weissman in Sacramento negotiated to do the consulting as well as personalized recruiting which enabled fair compensation.

In regard to consultants, the project secured the services of Professors Griffith and Swan to aid local task forces during the workshop. Both of these leaders had excellent rapport with the participants in their area, and their support of the task force concept was a key factor in the success achieved. Both contributed extra time and energy in recruiting participants, and Dr. Griffith's efforts on our behalf with the Fresno Unified School District were a crucial factor in their participation. Likewise, both agreed upon short notice to deliver instructional modules which our junior staff hesitated to attempt. Again, our limited payment can't begin to compensate for these services. Certainly, future projects should substantially increase the payment for coordinators and long-term regional consultants.

Coordination also entailed securing the services of a host of local experts, who in all cases showed themselves outstanding as will be seen in ratings of their presentations. Dr. Healy, upon notice of Dr. Quinn's departure, hired and briefed the 25 Los Angeles guest presenters and panelists, and then he delegated this responsibility to Dr. Markert who assumed the coordinator position. Fortunately, these presenters learned quickly, because initially there was not enough time to fully apprise them of their charge or audience.

Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee met four times over the course of the project. They offered technical advice about materials, presenters, and recruitment, reviewed instructional materials and project progress, and examined the outline of the final report and overviewed the supporting data. They offered encouragement, ongoing support, and realistic perspective of the field-wise leader. Many of them helped the project, instructing in one or more workshops. During the course of the project, each was always available to the project leaders. Their timely advice and willingness to critique ideas proved very helpful. They are listed in Figure 1.

Our only recommendation for change in such services would be to give the advisory committee more time to review instructional materials and provide time for a subgroup to observe an entire workshop.

FIGURE 1

Advisory Committee for Career Counseling Task Forces Workshop

Dr. Melvin Barlow, Professor Emeritus
Vocational Education
Graduate School of Education
UCLA

Mrs. Pat Cook
Director of Career Guidance Center
Cerritos Community College
11110 E. Alondra Boulevard
Norwalk, CA 90650

Mr. Bennett Dolin, Vice President
Career Development H19-1
Security Pacific National Bank
P. O. Box 2097-Terminal Annex
Los Angeles, CA 90051

Dr. Augustine Geoghagen, Counselor
Los Angeles Southwest College
1600 Imperial Highway
Los Angeles, CA 90047

Dr. Thomas Jacobson, Director
Grants and Contracts/School Improvement
Grossmont Union High School District
1100 Murray Drive, P. O. Box 1043
La Mesa, CA 92041

Mr. Edward Muraski, Dean
Occupational Education
El Camino College
16007 Crenshaw Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90506

Professor Jane Matson
Counseling Education
California State University, Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Dr. Gerald Ohlson
Glen Oaks Program Manager and Consultant
County Regional Career Guidance
Los Angeles County Supt. of Schools
1123 Rives Avenue
Downey, CA 90241

Professor Robert Swan
Counselor Education
California State University, Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Bvvd.
Long Beach, CA 90840

Dr. Steven Sheldon
Director of Institutional Research
Los Angeles Pierce Community College
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Dr. David Taxis, Director
Western Center for Vocational Education
4665 Lompoon Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

Dr. Anne Upton, Director
Personnel and Career Guidance
California State Department of Education
921 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

FIGURE 2

Special Consultants/Presenters
Who Contributed at Several Sites

Contributor	Contribution
Dr. Stan Greene, California State Dept. of Education (attended Fresno and Orange County Workshops)	Presenter
Dr. Paul Peters, California State Dept. of Education (attended Fresno, Orange County and Sacramento Workshops)	Presenter
Mr. John Rothrock, Huntington Beach High School (attended Fresno, Los Angeles, Orange County and Sacramento Workshops)	Presenter
Dr. Robert Swan, California State University, Long Beach (attended Los Angeles and Orange County Workshops)	Presenter

FIGURE 3

Contributors to Workshops

Fresno Workshop

Contributor	Contribution
Mr. Leonel Alvarado, Fresno City Council	Panelist
Mr. Howard Atamian, Fresno Unified School District	Coordinator
Mr. Bob Case, Fresno Unified School District	Promoter
Ms. Jean Denham, Denham Personnel Agency	Panelist
Ms. Mary Alice Easton, Fresno City College	Panelist
Mr. Bill Forston, Ceres Unified School District	Presenter
Mr. Charlie Fox, McLane High School	Contributor/Participant
Dr. I. Ace Griffiths, California State University, Fresno	Consultant/Presenter
Mr. Lonnie Hayhurst, County Personnel Department	Panelist
Ms. Hannah Hockman, Fresno City College	Panelist
Mrs. Lula Hooks, Pacific Telephone	Panelist
Dr. Harold Jones, California State University, Fresno	Panelist
Mr. David Kloth, Security Pacific Bank	Panelist
Dr. Clyde McCully, President, Fresno City College	Host
Mrs. Ellen Moradian, Internal Revenue Service	Panelist
Ms. Dorothy Marsh, Fresno City College	Panelist
Ms. Gret Mortimar, Fresno City College	Panelist
Mr. Roger Perry, Ceres Unified School District	Presenter
Mr. Eric Rasmussen, Fresno City College	Panelist
Mr. Dave Robertson, Roosevelt High School	Contributor/Participant
Mr. Eric Swearingen, McDonalds Restaurants	Panelist

Los Angeles Workshop

Dr. Bill Bendat, Moorpark Community College	Presenter
Mr. John Blackwell, UCLA	Panelist
Mr. Richard Blythe, California Dept. of Rehabilitation	Panelist
Mrs. Pat Cook, Cerritos Community College	Panelist
Mr. Brian Cute, UCLA	Presenter
Mr. Ben Dolin, Security Pacific Bank	Panel Moderator
Mr. Bob Erhmann, UCLA	Arranger
Mr. Maurice Flora, Charter Oak Unified School District	Presenter
Mr. Walter Gembica, Los Angeles County Supt. of Schools	Presenter
Mr. Dick Hererias, IBM	Panelist
Dr. Tom Jacobson, Grossmont Union High School District	Presenter
Mr. Robert Mantovani, Long Beach City College	Presenter
Ms. Ann Marshall, UCLA	Presenter
Ms. Marilyn Maze, Contra Costa College	Presenter
Ms. Barbara McGowan, UCLA	Presenter
Ms. Joan Mount, Employment Development Department	Panelist
Mr. Edward Muraski, El Camino College	Presenter
Ms. Ruth Purcell, UCLA	Presenter
Mr. Donald Reid, IBM	Panelist
Ms. Gloria Rose, Industry and Education Council	Presenter
Dr. Len Steinberg, California State University, Los Angeles	Presenter
Dr. Robert Swan, California State University, Long Beach	Presenter
Mr. Mike Watney, IBM	Arranger
Mr. Richard Woolard, Dept. of Water and Power	Panelist

Los Angeles Workshop (cont.)

Other Contributors

El Camino College
IBM
Lucky Markets
Market Basket
Safeway Stores
United Methodist Church, Westwood
UCLA Medical Center

Orange County Workshop

Contributor	Contribution
Mr. Bob Clattenbuck, California State Dept. of Vocational Rehabilitation	Panelist
Mrs. Pat Cook, Cerritos Community College	Presenter
Mr. Jim Curley, Orange County Dept. of Education	Coordinator
Dr. Jim Gorman, Orange Coast College	Panelist
Mr. Dan Holut, Guin Foss School	Host
Mr. Don Isbell, Orange Unified School District	Presenter
Mr. Dick Johnson, Employment Development Department	Panelist
Mr. Sol Tomberg, California State Dept. of Industrial Relations	Panelist

Sacramento Workshop

Mr. Glen Berlo, McClellan Air Force Base	Panelist
Colonel Butera, McClellan Air Force Base	Panelist
Major Connell, McClellan Air Force Base	Panelist
Dr. Michael Dillon, California State University, Sacramento	Presenter
Dr. Barbara Dubnick, Center for Family, Organizational and Individual Development	Presenter
Ms. Sally Green, McClellan Air Force Base	Panelist
Mr. Sid Henderson, McClellan Air Force Base	Panelist
Dr. Jack Jenkins, Sacramento Office of Education	Consultant
Dr. Don Johnson, Sacramento City College	Presenter
Dr. Nina Krebs, Center for Family, Organizational, and Individual Development	Presenter
Mr. Todd Lee, California State University, Sacramento	Panelist
General Dewey Lowe, McClellan Air Force Base	Host
Colonel Scott Mize, McClellan Air Force Base	Host/Coordinator
Mr. George Montgomery, Valley High School	Presenter/Participant
Ms. Nancy Pequeno, Sacramento High School	Presenter
Colonel Redding, McClellan Air Force Base	Panelist
Mr. Howard Spade, San Juan Unified School District	Panelist
Ms. Sharon Strauss, Sacramento City College	Panelist
Mr. Allen Taylor, McClellan Air Force Base	Panelist
Mr. Don Thomas, Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Host
Mr. Harold Webb, University of California, Davis	Panelist
Dr. Shel Weissman, California State University, Sacramento	Coordinator

Project Contributors

In addition to the Advisory Committee the project had substantial assistance from many others. We are sincerely grateful for thier generous aid and have listed their names in Figures 2 and 3 in order to testify to their generosity.

Instructional Material

Dr. Sorenson created three instructional units which can serve as a framework for an accountable, career guidance program. Designed especially for a task-force orientation, these units succinctly, yet in an intellectually stimulating way, alert the professional to key concepts and principles. The first, entitled a Framework for Career Counseling, addresses the organization of a multi-disciplinary career guidance program. The second called an Outline of a Cognitive Framework for Counseling Psychology with Illustrative Cases of Joe Taylor and the Elkhorn School explains the rationale of problem solving counseling and consulting, identifies and underscores key concepts and ideas, and provides practice exercises for verifying learner understanding. The final unit, Notes on Evaluating, supplemented by exercises developed by Dr. Healy, introduces evaluation in a way that is understandable and readily operationalizable for educational activities. Needless to say, this is an important accomplishment because of educators' reluctance for instruction in evaluation. Since, as Guilford pointed out, evaluation is one of the major intellectual operations, every learner comes to evaluation instruction with tacit, long exercised evaluation habits and belief systems. Consequently, the manifest power of Sorenson's notes to stimulate focused discussion speaks well of his materials. These materials are being filed in the ERIC system under the title Materials for a Workshop in Career Guidance and Counseling.

As a consequence of creating and trying out these instructional devices in the workshops, Dr. Sorenson inferred that a workshop lesson should consist of the following:

a) Written materials describing the background definitions, and key propositions,
b) A short, pointed oral presentation highlighting the major ideas to be taught,
c) An exercise to enable the learners to apply the ideas, and
d) Feedback about their effectiveness in the exercise,
e) Group discussion in which participants are permitted to raise questions, ask for clarification, and express their own ideas.

In terms of evaluation materials, two forms created by Dr. Healy and Ms. Yen, although simple, were helpful. The first was the Team Progress Sheet, and the second was the Participant Evaluation Form. The progress sheet had the task force recorder report number of extra workshop meetings and indicate progress according to the following: Setting goals, getting student involvement in particular guidance activities, creating new activities or coordinating activities, involving school staff in career guidance, securing materials and other resources for guidance, evaluating career guidance, activities to be implemented this year, and school/district persons to be informed/recruited. Perusal of the two-page form helped the consultant to establish a task force's direction and priorities quickly, and it provided clues about the obstacles to their progress. Were the form revised, the authors would add items about perceived obstacles and kinds of help needed.

The revised participant evaluation form used in the spring workshops elicited three kinds of information from participants: their ability to name the presentation's major ideas, their view of the usefulness of these ideas, and their suggestions for improving the presentation in terms of its organization, length, pace of delivery, and practicality of ideas. A single form like this was completed without threat to participants, and it enabled both verifying that participants were hearing the intended ideas and finding out whether they liked them. Responses indicated that most participants could complete the forms within five minutes and that the information was useful. When we use the form again, we shall ask respondents to list recommended changes for content, presentation length, etc., rather than merely note aspects requiring modification. Such information from the learners facilitates formative evaluation.

Consultation

As noted, all staff consulted with task force groups at the workshop, and Drs. Bob Swan, Ace Griffiths and Shel Weissman joined in this at Orange, Fresno and Sacramento respectively. Dr. Weissman also consulted with teams at their sites and Dr. Griffiths plans to give each team a follow up visit in September. In May, 1980, Drs. Healy and Markert and Mr. Drew Sorensen provided follow-up consultation to the eight Los Angeles task force groups which wished the service.

Consultation by staff and local experts at the workshops entailed clarifying the task force orientation and other ideas in the workshop, encouraging continued

focus on career guidance planning, active participation in planning, prompting cross team linking, trouble-shooting suggestions about resource materials and people, and limited assistance in obtaining these. The May consultation entailed stimulating an updating of plan, offering soundings about different facets of a program, and suggesting resources and next steps.

At the workshop project staff met with teams over exercises during the presentations, in the scheduled planning periods and over coffee and lunch. This was important, for as an independent observer noted, "more constructive program planning was accomplished than could have been anticipated." Nevertheless, presentation overruns, starting delays, and inability of educators to stay beyond 3:00 p.m. prevented as extensive use of consultants at the workshop as intended. Moreover, consultation during the workshop sometimes was available before task forces were clear about what they needed from such services and it was given on a non-scheduled basis, not necessarily the time most suitable for participants. Considering these experiences, coupled with the benefits observed from the May follow-up consultations, the authors recommend that only limited consulting resources be available at the workshop. The rest of the consulting resources could be used by giving vouchers for teams to cash in with staff and regional consultants. In this project's workshops, such an arrangement would have meant taking fewer project staff to each workshop. The local consultants, it would seem, should attend a full workshop. In this project, Drs. Swan's, Griffiths' and Mr. Atamian's faithful attendance gave them a better grasp of what their consultees were learning, and it enabled them to make constructive criticisms which aided formative evaluation of their workshops.

RESTATEMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Following is a condensation of the original objectives. In reporting accomplishments and discrepancies, these objectives are treated under four categories:

1. team development and planning progress - This was the first and primary objective. It was the raison d'etre.
2. individual learning of concepts and practices - Objectes 2 - 10 were designed to measure participant growth in technical knowledge of career guidance and in follow through of workshop practices.
3. attendance
4. personal growth of participants in career maturity--objective 12.

1. At least 70% of the teams of counselors and educators from schools will coalesce into functioning units for delivering career counseling. They will meet during and between workshop sessions as verified by observation and report. They will develop a written plan that describes their intended vocational guidance services, and they will secure their administrator's support of the plan within 60 days of the last workshop session.

2. By the close of the workshops at least 75% of the trainees who attend 80% or more of the sessions will be able to write a description of a systematic career counseling procedure which contains explicit and concrete guidelines with examples. Within two months at least 70% of the counselors attending the session will try out the procedure or parts of it with students, pinpointing their own strengths and weaknesses in using the procedures, and 70% will review their self-rating with a co-principal investigator or research assistant in order to verify their self-appraisal and receive guidance about further practice.

2a. Within two months at least 70% of the participants will complete an exercise of observing and contrasting persons from their school or community who are succeeding in careers with persons who are having career difficulties. In the exercise they will identify characteristics and beliefs which distinguish the small samples of each group, and they will indicate the implications for counseling programs.

3. At least 80% of the trainees attending the smorgasbord module will correctly answer 75% of the cognitive questions on their selected topics. Within one month, 70% of the participants will report efforts at implementing at least one practice or idea from one of the presentations.

4. At least 80% of the counselors who attend the decision making module will answer 75% of the cognitive items on the career guidance test about concepts, instructional strategies, and materials for teaching decision making. Furthermore 80% will report that they have identified alternative approaches by which they can help their students to learn decision making and that the strategies are fair to persons of different sexes, races, ethnic groups, and physical condition.

5. At least 80% of the trainees attending the placement module will correctly answer 75% of the guidance test questions pertaining to job search strategies and job information retrieval systems.

6. At least 80% of those attending the Career Clusters and Special Population Module will complete successfully 75% of the guidance test items on

career clusters, characteristics of typical career paths, methods of assisting special groups pursue non-traditional and primary labor section careers and 70% of participants will report the module has updated their understanding of the topics covered. Within two months moreover, 70% of the participants will report that they have investigated the possibility of industrial tours for students.

7. At least 80% or more of the trainees participating in the community-education interface module will answer correctly 70% of the guidance test items on California urban and rural labor market trends, opportunities for work exploration for students and educators, methods of job development in inner city and rural areas, and methods of helping the disadvantaged and handicapped occupations from which they have traditionally been excluded. Moreover, 75% will name at least one new contact they intend to follow up as a consequence of the interface module.

8. At least 80% of the educators attending the self appraisal and testing module will correctly answer 75% of the items from the guidance test on such concepts as what tests can and cannot tell, methods of appraising self, collaborating with vocational and academic teachers in student appraisal, and methods suitable for appraising disadvantaged, handicapped and limited English-speaking students.

9. At least 80% of the trainees attending the module on counseling and program evaluation will be able to answer 75% of the guidance test items on evaluation concepts and strategies and will indicate that they feel more comfortable about participating in evaluation. Moreover, 70% of the participants will list one new action which they can take either in their career counseling role or as educators generally as a consequence of our instruction on evaluation.

10. At least 80% of the trainees attending the module on Laws and Testing for women, minorities and handicapped will correctly answer 75% of the test items on these topics. And 80% will indicate that they are planning to consider more deeply how counseling can help advance careers of women, handicapped, and disadvantaged in light of changing laws and new means of career testing.

11. At least 70% of the enrolled participants will attend 80% or more of the sessions as evidenced by their return of rating material on the session at the close of the session.

12. A significant number of participants will increase their own career maturity over the workshop as measured on the project's Career Growth Index.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This part of the report details achievements resulting from the project in terms of team development, technical learning and satisfaction, attendance and personal growth.

Team Coalescence and Program Planning

Representatives of 58 high schools, colleges, and agencies attended one or more sessions of the workshop. Based upon evaluation of plan outlines, completed progress planning sheets, and contacts with and observations of these potential task forces during the project, the staff agreed that at least 40 task forces had progressed in becoming functioning units for orchestrating career guidance. Of the 18 groups who met only at our workshops without advising superiors of their intention of being a team or dissolved, half attended only 25% of the offerings, or their members never believed that they could become a team. Of the remaining nine groups, members of at least three were planning to seek sanction from officials for a task force approval.

Task forces varied greatly in their progress in becoming teams and in creating programs. Our staff estimated that about 10% of those progressing had planned and initiated aspects of a career guidance program consonant with the aims of the workshop. Another 60% or so of the teams had advanced in working together as a team and in extending and systematizing preexisting programs, while the remaining 30% had progressed in initial planning and informed superiors about their efforts. Following are illustrations of these three progress categories.

Programs launched were of two kinds. One involved establishing and staffing career centers and making advanced plans for building a volunteer teacher infusion program around the center. The second type consisted of agreement about specific grade level objectives, articulation of objectives across grades, and creation of particular strategies, such as two-week infusion units in English or social studies, to achieve some of the goals. As in the first kind of program, there was provision for continued planning about strategies for the other goals.

The category of progress in team coalescence and improvement of systematic guidance services included many different kinds of advances. One team brought together its pivotal career educators and principal to get better acquainted with each other's views and current operations. This was a first time event. As a consequence, these educators set mutually agreeable goals and pooled ideas for the 1980-81 program. Each knew the other's interests, and they planned so that

the next year's program projected a component for each. This assured that each would be able to support what the leaders would get the district to approve. Another team identified priorities, resources, and consultants necessary for expanding a community college career center from a closet to a modern facility. Several high schools improved career center resources and operations using the student folder concept and planned integration of teacher infusion activities. In the course of only four days, another high school established grade objectives and the willingness of its different department members to accept responsibility for particular objectives, only to have fiscal shifts cancel next year's allocations for career guidance. During the same four-day period an advanced team created a plan for assisting all high schools in the district to adapt suitable elements of the district's demonstration's school infusion based program. Over several months another team executed its absentee reduction program successfully, and on the basis of the success of their team effort, expanded its focus to other career guidance concerns and identified priorities to lobby for with the incoming principal.

In the same period, a high school team completed preliminary needs assessment, had plans for upgrading the career center approved, improved integration of college and vocational counseling, and laid the groundwork for enlisting teachers from different departments in infusion. Several other teams, in turn, visited exemplary programs, secured extra workshop speakers, identified and ordered materials, and pinpointed strategies to implement in the 1980-81 year. These activities were meritorious because task force members were informing one another of their intentions and coordinating efforts in order to systematically approach an objective.

The final category, which is commitment to further planning and acquisition of superior support for such planning, covers a more limited set of achievements and are peopled mainly by teams from the shorter, spring workshops. Essentially, members of these task forces increased their understanding of one another and their concensus about proper objectives of a career guidance program for their schools--generally high schools or 9th grade schools. Often they agreed about particular priorities such as establishment and staffing of a career center, inservice training, a career day, and systematic student needs assessment, and in all cases they informed their superiors about progress and their intention of continuing as a task force.

Several factors appeared to contribute to team progress over the workshop. Most successful teams had members of different occupations who had personal

commitment to career education and who were willing to work cooperatively. They clarified one another's positions about career education early. These teams generally addressed program planning during the appointed time. They established goals early, had one or more members who was knowledgeable about the career guidance field, and had a member willing to exert leadership. This person was not necessarily the career guidance expert. Some of the more successful teams had received funding for career guidance or were even carrying out projects during the workshop. However, three parochial high schools and several other schools without external funding progressed considerably more than the average.

Over the project, several teams were able to resolve difficulties stemming from lack of resources, lack of time, and lack of back-home support. To increase time and resources, a couple of schools expanded use of student aides, thereby extending career center services and freeing counselors to give time to program planning; some borrowed materials from libraries, corporations, or other schools; some teams gave up occasional lunch hours for team meetings; other teams enlisted parent contributions for career materials; and one counselor from a parochial school even took a temporary job to pay for career education materials. To build back-home support of their emerging program plan, some teams scheduled inspirational guest speakers; some had influence leaders visit exemplary programs or participate in team meetings; some arranged interest testing and interpretation for the entire faculty; some asked for the assistance of key faculty and arranged for them to have career education responsibilities; and some reduced goals to more realizable levels in order to be credible.

Technical Learning and Satisfaction

This section presents the participant evaluations of each workshop and its modules. First a workshop's overall ratings are reviewed, and then the ratings for particular modules are examined. The section closes with a summary of the authors' impressions about these data.

Los Angeles

The Los Angeles effort started as two workshops, but these were merged on the fourth meeting in order to save resources for a spring, Wednesday afternoon workshop because enrollments of the two together did not reach the 90 anticipated for one. We intended to do extensive formative evaulation in the Los Angeles workshop, using it as a shakedown for future workshops. As a consequence, the initial modules were presented to two groups of participants, and were varied somewhat the second time.

Table 1 presents the ratings of the 39 participants who attended the final Saturday meeting and who supplied usable ratings. Table 1 shows that a large majority of the respondents were clear about the workshop's purpose by the close, had been stimulated to think about its ideas, had considered pertinent problems, had a guide for future action, and felt they had worked as a group with teammates. Individual comments noted the usefulness of particular presentations, and a few decried failure of their teammates to become more committed to a task group effort, even suggesting their replacement by students.

Turning to particular kinds of stimulation attributable to the workshop, Table 2 indicates the number of respondents who had tried or believed they would try out particular practices from the workshop and the numbers who did not feel particular activities were useful. Somewhat surpisingly and unnoticed by the staff during the workshop itself, a relatively large percentage had composed a career autobiography according to the workshop format and had been stimulated by the Career Growth Index to reflect about their own career. This reflection and autobiographical effort may have contributed to the significant change in Career Growth Index Scores registered over the project, as reported later. Somewhat disappointingly, the majority of respondents only were intending to act on the workshop ideas by its completion--i.e., had not actually begun new activities. We had hoped that they would act and consult with our staff about correcting or sustaining their actions. Of course, the relatively short-time frame of the project may have been inadequate to allow such immediate follow up. It is encouraging that a majority of participants rated each element of the workshop as worth attempting to apply.

Turning to particular modules, Tables 3, 4, 5 present ratings of modules about which summative data were obtained. These data are largely self evident when considered with the description of the module to which they refer. Such descriptions follow.

Name Los Angeles N = 90

(Data available for N = 39)

TABLE 1

Los Angeles Participants' Overall Satisfaction (Frequencies)

N = 39

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Un-decided	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
1. The purposes of this workshop were clear to me.	16	18	2	2	1
2. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topics presented.	12	20	5	2	
3. Possible solutions to my problems were considered.	13	22	3	1	
4. I have no guide for future action.		2	3	17	17
5. We worked together as a group.	16	16	3	1	3

Name Los Angeles N = 90
(Data available for N = 43)

TABLE 2

Willingness of Los Angeles Workshop Participants to Try Workshop Ideas and Activities

N = 43

Activity	Col A (have tried)	Col B (will try)	Col C (not useful)	Col D (don't recall)	Col E (missed presentation)
1. Complete own autobiography according to instructions in Career Counseling Notebook.	13	15	7	3	-
2. Have students do career autobiography described in Notebook.	1	26	7	2	-
3. Have students or colleagues do "career wire" presented by Dr. Healy.	3	23	7	3	1
4. Have students or colleagues debate pros and cons of planning as illustrated by Dr. Quinn's presentation.	8	10	4	13	1
5. Teach colleagues or students about career counseling through case method modeled by Dr. Sorenson.	6	24	9	1	2
6. Use Dr. Sorenson's case or facsimile with students in career guidance.	5	20	7	3	2
7. Use baseline list introduced by Dr. Healy to help formulate your school's program.	4	13	6	15	-
8. Try to obtain the information about student career concerns suggested by Dr. Healy's presentation on interviewing.	12	22	-	2	1
9. Use circle graph described by Dr. Healy in career guidance.	8	24	5	5	-
10. Reconsider school policy on interest testing following Ms. Barbara McGowan's presentation of the Strong-Cambell Interest Inventory.	11	17	5	-	2
11. Reconsider your own career direction following the Strong-Campbell.	13	12	10	-	2

Activity	Col A (have tried)	Col B (will try)	Col C (not useful)	Col D (don't recall)	Col D (missed presentation)
12. Reflect upon your career as a consequence of the Career Growth Index which you completed at outset and are asked to repeat.	16	14	7	1	2
13. Teach some of the job search procedures illustrated at UCLA Placement Center.	10	26	-	1	4
14. Use some of materials on job seeking distributed at UCLA Placement Center.	7	22	1	-	4
15. Employ some of the career infusion ideas from the packet of ideas given your team.	11	28	1	-	1
16. Apply some of the career infusion ideas recommended by Maurice Flora on Dec. 8th.	5	18	1	4	12
17. Use references or tests from the Career Skills Assessment Program distributed by Dr. Healy.	2	21	4	6	5
18. Use ideas about career guidance class given by Ed Muraski on December 8th.	8	7	3	4	13
19. Follow some of advice on career centers offered by Pat Cook on December 8th.	7	9	-	1	18
20. Try out ideas and practices suggested by John Rothrock on December 8th.	7	14	-	6	13
21. Conduct a community educator interface panel for staff and parents at your school in order to promote cooperation.	5	25	6	1	3
22. Follow up one or more leads from community-educator interface panel.	6	22	6	4	5
23. Arrange field trip similar to UCLA one for staff or students.	7	24	6	-	2
24. Use lyrics/poetry to infuse career development as illustrated by Lou Markert on December 8th.	3	3	11	4	17
25. Have colleagues or students rate importance of school meeting Flanagan's 15 values, as Sorenson modeled.	5	22	3	9	4

TABLE 3

Participant Evaluations for Selected Los Angeles Presentations

Module	Mean Ratings* Usefulness	Interest	Difficulty	Organization	Learning	N
Quality of Life-Los Angeles-Garth Sorenson	4.7	4.8	3.7	5.0	4.3	36
Planning Debate-Los Angeles-James Quinn	4.7	4.4	3.2	4.7	4.2	36
Problem Solving-Los Angeles-Garth Sorenson	5.0	5.0	3.4	5.0	4.6	31
Interviewing-Los Angeles-Charles Healy	4.4	4.4	3.1	4.3	4.0	30
Elkhorn Case-Los Angeles-Garth Sorenson	4.6	3.9	3.4	4.5	3.8	30
Target Groups-Los Angeles-Garth Sorenson	4.3	4.9	3.4	3.1	3.7	33
Quality of Life-Orange County-Garth Sorenson	4.5	5.0	3.7	4.4	4.2	39
Problem-Solving-Orange County-Garth Sorenson	4.9	4.5	3.0	4.6	4.0	37

*The evaluation instrument asked the participants to indicate their feelings about the presentation, using five seven-point scales with the following meanings:

1. Usefulness: 0 means not relevant; 6 means very useful.
2. Interest: 0 means dull; 6 means interesting.
3. Difficulty: 0 means too easy; 6 means too difficult.
4. Organization: 0 means poorly organized; 6 means well organized.
5. Learning: 0 means "I learned a little;" 6 means "I learned a lot."

Day One

The workshop began 45 minutes late because of parking difficulties. Dr. Healy opened the workshop by welcoming the participants, introducing the staff, and giving an overview of the project. He emphasized the importance of the team concept and highlighted the notion of career development, including a few background remarks about career education and a definition of key terms. He referred participants to the material in their notebooks and led them in an activity, the Career Development Wire," illustrating the life-span, ongoing nature of career development. Participants explained their "wires" to other team members and shared general reactions with the group. Following this, Dr. Healy introduced the notion of "guided inquiry counseling" and had team members role play the initial phases of this counseling approach as it might be applied to a personal career-related concern.

After lunch, Dr. James Quinn presented a module on issues and procedures relevant to planning school programs. He referred to the essay given to the participants outlining a management and operations approach to planning and underscored such principles as developing a clear policy statement, planning with others and not for them, and stipulating which tasks are to be done by which individuals and when they should be completed. Dr. Quinn then led participants in an activity in which they debated the pros and cons of career education. This activity generated much discussion and encouraged participants to clarify the assumptions they had about career guidance and its place in their schools.

Dr. Sorenson then followed with a presentation on goals setting. He introduced the notion of establishing educational priorities and cited research from Project Talent to suggest typical priorities appropriate for today's schools. He led participants through an exercise (Quality of Life Survey) adapted from this research to help them establish goals for their guidance programs.

Day Two

Dr. Sorenson outlined the principles of problem solving counseling. He summarized key points from his essay on a cognitive framework for counseling (provided in participants' notebooks) and reviewed a series of assumptions, definitions, and propositions relevant to problem solving counseling. Following this discussion, Dr. Sorenson utilized the Joe Taylor Case Summary to give participants practice in this method of counseling.

In the second Los Angeles workshop Dr. Healy pointed out several interviewing techniques to help establish what a student felt about his concerns, what he believed were causing/supporting them, what he had tried, and what he wanted to accomplish and believed was accomplishment. These psychodiagnostic concerns derived from the problem solving approach to counseling, and Dr. Healy had participants practice eliciting them in order to explicate one method of obtaining data to compose cases like Joe Taylor. Table 3 shows that many participants believed the rules of thumb and diagnostic benchmarks were helpful. The staff and presenter, however, observed that some counselors complained that the exercise was elementary for them, while some teachers and counselors wondered why the workshop was focusing on individual student appraisal instead

of infusion and other group methods. These reactions and subsequent participant feedback announced the strong interest in infusion methods and the limited interest in developing an individual advisor program as a central component of a career guidance program.

After lunch Dr. Sorenson continued his discussion of a problem solving model of counseling. He presented a series of heuristic rules that might serve as guidelines for counseling and then used the Elkhorn School Case Summary to illustrate how these rules apply. Participants read the summary and discussed issues generated by the exercise.

Day Three

Dr. Markert opened the meeting by moderating a "team-feedback" session. Attending teams introduced themselves, describing the career guidance programs at their schools, and summarized the objectives that they hoped to achieve through the workshop.

Dr. Sorenson discussed identifying target populations for guidance services and ways of distinguishing successful from nonsuccessful students. He provided guidelines for helping teams to decide priorities for service and to start identifying and inventing guidance interventions which were likely to work in the team's school. The participant ratings suggested that many felt some benefit from the presentation, but that some had difficulty following the presentation. Staff, in turn, noted that identifying special populations for priority treatment conflicted with many teams' intentions of launching or improving a general program before modifying a program for special groups. Likewise, some expected to learn prepackaged solutions rather than have to create programs based upon what succeeders had learned to do. In retrospect, more time and background reading may have enabled the participant to recognize that the ideas contained in the presentations could become part of the foundation of a professional career guidance program. Since the authors judged that more time than was available in the project was necessary for appreciation of this module and that all necessary support materials hadn't been produced, they deleted it when the workshop shrunk to four days.

The other major presentation on Day 3 featured comprehensive review and group interpretation of the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory by Ms. Barbara McGowan. Ms. McGowan described the bases for the interpretations which the SCII provided, and she discussed the meanings of different scores and profiles. This augmented the interpretation provided by the Interpretive Scoring Systems profile which was given participants. A majority of respondents felt that the interpretation experience itself helped them to better understand the value of interest inventories, whereas a small minority was disappointed because more attention wasn't given to instruments which they could use with their students. Again, the limited time for covering the area of interest assessment was a major obstacle. The quality of the presentation impressed the staff, and they were disappointed that a sizable minority of participants was only mildly concerned about the evidence underlying interest inventory scores. A few participants even seemed willing to use "interest inventories" that had definite risks of limiting exploration and reinforcing obstructive occupational stereotypes as long as students would complete them and could get quick, inexpensive, easily-interpretable results.

In the second workshop, Dr. Healy squeezed in a presentation on self-awareness appraisal to augment the interest inventory presentation. This was designed to meet the needs of more relevance. He defined concepts, noted the risks in using limited perspectives in self-appraisal, and pointed out some of the ways in which teams might use the Career Skills Assessment Program in a career guidance program. (Each team received a specimen set of this recent battery.). The participants appreciated a life space or role delineation exercise that exemplified a method helping a person put career into perspective, while some resented efforts to emphasize ideas through paraphrasing.

Day Four

The fourth workshop day on Saturday, December 8, featured a smorgasbord of presenters and topics at El Camino College through the graciousness of Mr. Ed. Muraski. Each presenter led a two-hour presentation in the morning and repeated it in the afternoon. Topics covered included: infusion, computer counseling, guided inquiry counseling, counseling via the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, group career counseling, career counseling through poetry/lyrics, an exemplary career center, career guidance class, an exemplary high school career guidance program, and an exemplary community college program. Overall ratings of the presentations were excellent. However, the counseling and individual student sessions were almost ignored, whereas the exemplary high school program, infusion presentation, group guidance class, and career center drew the large majority of participants. Table 4 summarizes participant ratings for the best attended sessions. Informal conversations confirmed the strong interest in strategies requiring minimal change and limited involvement by teachers in career guidance.

Day Five

The fifth day of the workshop featured a community panel moderated by Mr. Ben Dolin, task force discussion of the place of community in their program, and a field visit to UCLA Medical Center or the IBM business machines marketing facility. Mr. Dolin skillfully guided the panelists who had been recruited and briefed by Drs. Healy and Markert in explicating the efforts of their agencies in career education and in sharing their advice and reactions from their involvement in career education. The staff noted the active participant questioning and positive feeling from the interaction, in spite of the fact that use of an IBM facility in downtown L.A. led nearly half of the participants but none of the panelists to be more than a half hour late. The participant comments that staff collected indicated that they appreciated leads to follow-up contacts, hearing directly about the importance of communication skills and work habits in career, learning about particular programs, and having opportunity to interact with panelists. A minority of the audience was dissatisfied with one presentation, and a few resented "plugs" for a particular agency or company. Only one or two believed that the panel would not benefit teachers. Indeed, several teams contact panelists for presentations to their schools and faculty.

The afternoon field trips to IBM and UCLA were taken by half the people attending the morning session. These attending, however, felt that they learned useful points for organizing such trips, and a few participants were stimulated to consider leaving education for different kinds of careers. Table 5 reflects the reactions of the groups who visited the IBM and UCLA facilities.

TABLE 4

Participant Statements for the Most Highly Attended Los Angeles Smorgasbord Sessions on December 8, 1979

Career Guidance Class (Mr. Ed. Muraski) — Respondents = 14

Useful Ideas/Activities	Suggested Improvements	Nonuseful Elements
Structure of course (3)	Move slower in the recitation of materials (1)	None
Emphasis of future job availability (2)	Copy of curriculum in use (3)	
Systematic approach (4)	Role playing (1)	
Organized note-taking (1)	Do group task of what learned in session (1)	
General information (4)	Overhead or other audio-visual (1)	
Clustering (3)	Good presentation (5)	
Materials) (2)		

Career Center (Mrs. Pat Cook) — Respondents = 11

Blank outline to be filled in by individual (1)	Tour of career center (3)	Career supermarket (1)
Need program, then center (1)	More questions directed at participants about individual schools (2)	
Planning process (6)		
Use of materials (3)	Good presentation (5)	
Level of services in center (3)		
Interest test ideas (1)		
Areas of Improvement (2)		
Talking of center (2)		

Master Teacher Program (Mr. Maurice Flora) — Respondents = 13

Resources available (10)	Resource printout (1)	None
Examples of infusion (3)	Handouts as examples (2)	
Career ed, as process (2)	Too much personal discussion (1)	
Alternate method of instruction (2)	Tell that some areas more difficult for infusion than others(1)	
Having speakers (1)	Given overview of materials passed around (1)	
Motivation of staff (2)		
Definition of career ed. (1)	Good presentation (4)	
Understanding infusion (1)		
Training program for teachers (1)		

TABLE 4 (cont.)

High School Career Counseling (John Rothrock) — Respondents = 23

Useful Ideas/Activities	Suggested Improvements	Nonuseful Elements
Folder (6)	Film slides of activities (1)	Emphasis on college education (1)
Counseling a program, not a service (1)	More time over entire workshop (1)	Competency-based index (not enough time) (1)
Preventative counseling (1)	Teaching career infusion (1)	
Change in role of counselor (1)	Not everyone "in" on everything (1)	
Competency guide (1)	Excellent presentation (11)	
Information on infusion (5)		
Information on counseling techniques (3)		
Counselor input to career education (1)		
Interdisicplinary relations (1)		
Exact plan (3)		
Knowledge that something works (5)		
Not an additional program for school (1)		
Positive attitudes (1)		
Staff motivation ideas (1)		
Self motivation ideas (1)		
Decision-making development (1)		
Dealing with truancies (1)		

Strong-Campbell Inventory Interpretation (Barbara McGowan) — Respondents = 21

Use of test (5)	No response (6)	No response (7)
General intro and overview (5)	Questioned use of tests with all students (4)	Everything was useful (4)
Interpretation of inventory (5)	No revision/addition needed, good as is (4)	Lecture too long and detailed (3)
Relation between interests and occupations (2)	Need to condense presentation (3)	Historical background and some statistics (2)
Provided new idea(s) (2)	Present other tests more appropriate to high school (1)	Discussion on research (1)
Grouping and clustering (2)	Less sex biased (1)	Cross-references (1)
Handout was useful (1)	Suggest using a transparency (1)	Cannot use test since expensive (1)
Explanation of occupation scales (1)	Revise presentation to help teachers/counselors who do not have an hour to spare for one student (1)	Does not provide ready answer for student (1)
Male/female differences (1)	Test difficult to interpret on a group basis (1)	Background information too encompassing (1)
General occupation themes (1)	Provide specific example and discuss how to advise student (1)	Not as relevant to high school student (1)
Confirmed own choice (1)		
Everything was useful (1)		
Already familiar with inventory (1)		

TABLE 5

Los Angeles Participant Reactions To Field Visits

IBM Field Trip	N = 10
%	Useful ideas
60%	Information on employment criteria
50%	Career opportunities in business
30%	Pay ranges and working conditions
30%	Answers to audience questions
20%	Visiting IBM site
20%	Talking with IBM personnel
10%	Business image
10%	Communication of ideas
20%	Skills of good salespersons
%	Not useful
20%	Tour of office area
40%	None
10%	Focus on one business

Field Trip - UCLA Hospital	N = 7
%	Useful ideas, activities
57%	Education and training requirements for positions
43%	Financial rewards of positions
29%	Overview of jobs in health fields
29%	Job specifics
14%	Seeing UCLA facilities
14%	Hearing workers discuss job
14%	Seeing workers on the job
	Not useful
14%	Omitted importance of Spanish skills
43%	Not enough time
29%	None

Day Six

Day 6 of the workshp consisted of an introduction to job search and placement at the UCLA Placement Office by UCLA placement personnel, task force planning, and trouble shooting. In terms of the presentation by Ms. Marshall on job search and job interviewing training methods, the responses were very positive. Likewise, the responses to the overall program were highly favorable, although a few respondents wanted more attention to activities exclusively for high schoolers and a few resented the overlap in presentations. From the staff perspective, the presentations covered essential topics in job search and placement program organization and dispensed a wealth of information quickly. Had we a Spring L.A. workshop, we would have repeated this phase of the program.

After lunch and planning, task forces met with one of three California experts in Career Education. Dr. Tom Jacobson reviewed the importance of political considerations in program development and launching, leading several participating teams to add plans for expanding backing for their emerging programs. Dr. Swan shared his experiences about establishing programs and listed contacts which beginning teams could make. Participants found these helpful, but some regretted there wasn't more time for him to expand about programs that were successfully addressing particular problems. Dr. Bendat addressed the considerations and difficulties of establishing programs in community colleges with the few participants from the community college who participated in the Saturday portions of the workshop. His expertise and practical advice were applauded, and the participants hoped that they could apply some of the ideas, although feeling that their fragmented teams would prevent accomplishing much at their college.

Day Seven

This day's program focused on achieving sex and racial equity, team planning, and learning about career decision making and planning. Ms. Sue Miller, consultant in private practice, delivered the module on human equity issues. She illustrated how information gets distorted as it passes from one individual to another (the Rumor activity), then had the group brainstorm all the problems they could think of relevant to human equity issues (e.g., handicapped, minorities, women, etc.). This activity was carried out in teams which elected a spokesperson to report to the group. It encouraged teams to consider practical solutions to difficult problems. Ms. Miller closed by mentioning laws relevant to career counseling and special populations.

Following planning and lunch, Dr. Len Steinberg delivered a well-organized, engaging review of decision making concepts and methods to promote their development. He also led the participants through some exercises illustrating the necessity and possibility of taking account of future change in planning. Participant and staff interest was high with only one or two participants apologetically leaving before his 4:00 p.m. finish. The participants believed that Dr. Steinberg had provided several stimulating ideas and practices which they could use. The only negative remarks concerned too much too fast, and a preference for more attention to the individual problems.

Day Eight

The final workshop day included a review of program evaluation, a planning session, the workshop evaluation, and the team presentations of their emerging program plans. Dr. Sorenson highlighted key points in the evaluation essay and definitions distributed previously to the participants. This promoted discussion of "how to" evaluation issues. Staff rated the presentation as pertinent but controversial, yet could not make suggestions for particular improvements. Participant reactions were not collected because the next task involved the total workshop rating and a test.

After the testing and a 30-minutes team caucus, Drs. Healy and Sorenson facilitated sharing of program plans. Although not evaluated, some inspirational plans were set forth and provided an uplifting workshop close.

Attendance for the Eight Sessions was as follows:

85, 65, 74, 56, 50, 35, 38, and 37

Sacramento

Table 6 contains the ratings of the 18 Sacramento participants who evaluated the overall workshop. As with previous workshops, the ratings show that the majority of participants agreed that the workshop was worthwhile. It is noteworthy, however, that only slightly more than half agreed that the purpose of the program was clear by the end and that less than half were sure that solutions to their problems were considered or that materials in the team book were useful to them.

In terms of follow through, the majority of the 20 responding participants endorsed all aspects of the workshop which they could rate as something they would try to do or had already done. This underscores their opinion that the six days were helpful. Surprisingly, there was as much skepticism about the Strong Campbell Interest Inventory and the field trip as there was about the unpopular presentation of evaluation. Table 7 presents the supporting data.

In terms of specific presentations, Table 8 presents participant ratings of evaluated ones. These ratings and the character of the workshop are described in the following narration of the six days' activities.

Day One

The workshop convened at the Student Union Building at Sacramento State University. Dr. Healy opened by welcoming the teams, introducing the staff, and providing an overview of the modules. He emphasized the importance of team coalescence and highlighted the staff's desire to assist with coalescence.

Dr. Markert then introduced the Flanagan Survey, pointing out its purpose as a device to help teams focus upon goals appropriate to their schools and reminding participants that their goals must be translated into specific objectives and strategies. He instructed the teams to complete the survey and share the priorities they identified for their schools. The teams introduced themselves as they discussed their priorities.

Following the break, Dr. Healy outlined the features of a model career guidance program. He referred to the elements summarized in the participant notebooks and suggested that the development of a program is frequently a circular, on-going, multifaceted process.

After eliciting questions and comments about his presentation, Dr. Healy divided the teams into two rooms (high schools in one, colleges in the other). He asked that the teams plan independently and then share concerns with other teams in their room. Dr. Healy and Mr. Sorensen worked with high schools, while Drs. Markert and Weissman facilitated college team interaction.

After lunch Dr. Healy stressed the importance of establishing evaluation procedures in the beginning of a program, and he distinguished between formative and summative procedures. He reiterated the workshop's goals and then delivered a module on evaluation. He diagrammed a force field illustration to elicit arguments for and against evaluation. Table 8 shows that audience response to the presentation was the most negative of the project, reflecting as we discussed underformative evaluation that Dr. Healy was perceived as pushing along in the workshop in spite of the fact that many participants had not clarified their reason for being there.

Day Two

Day two was held at the Sacramento County School Offices. Dr. Markert opened the session by revising agenda and making announcements. Dr. Healy then introduced the notion of problem solving in career counseling and he requested that the participants read the Elkhorn Summary. Then he facilitated a discussion based upon this essay. The participants interacted freely, debating the pros and cons of questions stemming from the exercise.

After this discussion, Dr. Healy divided the group into four smaller circles, requesting that team members separate themselves into one of the four groups to get better acquainted with educators from other schools. He asked the groups to brainstorm common problems in their schools relevant to career guidance and to discuss specific strategies appropriate for these problems. After 30 minutes, each group chose a spokesperson who summarized the group's discussion.

Following the break, Mrs. Nancy Pequeño, a local teacher and member of the Master Trainers Program, delivered a module on infusion. She used passouts and an overhead projector to help participants prioritize basic career education concepts and to show them how to develop an infusion lesson by locating a newspaper article.

In the afternoon Dr. Healy facilitated the Joe Taylor case. He introduced the case study exercise, had individuals read the study and discuss it in the large group, and then requested that the participants break into smaller groups and discuss the kinds of concerns that plagued their own school systems. The staff circulated among these groups to help facilitate discussion. As in the morning session, the groups then summarized their discussions, and Dr. Healy elaborated upon key issues that were raised.

Day Three

The third session was held at the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District Training Center. It was delayed by 45 minutes because there were two training rooms in this complex, and half the participants went to the wrong room.

TABLE 6

Percentage of Respondents Willing to Try Ideas From the Spring Workshops

Activity		Col A (have tried)	Col B (will try)	Col C (not useful)	Col D (don't recall)	Col E (missed presentation)
1. Teach colleagues or students about career counseling through case method use in workshop.	O*	21%	67%	9%	0	0
	S*	10%	55%	15%	15%	5%
	F*	21%	68%	11%	0	0
2. Use career guidance components chart in notebook to help formulate your school's program.	O	15%	67%	15%	3%	0
	S	5%	65%	5%	20%	5%
	F	8%	82%	5%	3%	0
3. Use circle graph to enable students or colleagues to recognize different life roles and feel good about themselves.	O	0	70%	24%	3%	0
	S	5%	55%	10%	30%	0
	F	0	50%	24%	16%	0
4. Use ideas from evaluation essay and presentation to organize or revise the evaluation of your program.	O	3%	76%	21%	0	0
	S	15%	30%	25%	25%	5%
	F	11%	68%	13%	8%	0
5. Try particular evaluation strategies which were suggested in presentation.	O	6%	76%	6%	0	12%
	S	10%	50%	20%	10%	0
	F	11%	84%	5%	0	0
6. Reconsider school policy on interest testing following presentation of the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory. (For Sacramento Workshop only.)	O	0	0	0	0	0
	S	35%	20%	25%	5%	5%
	F	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reconsider your own career direction following the Strong-Campbell. (For Sacramento Workshop only.)	O	0	0	0	0	0
	S	30%	30%	35%	0	5%
	F	0	0	0	0	0
8. Reflect upon your career as a consequence of the Career Growth Index which you completed at outset and are asked to repeat.	O	34%	45%	6%	9%	3%
	S	35%	40%	15%	5%	5%
	F	26%	29%	21%	8%	0
9. Teach some of the job search procedures illustrated in the workshop.	O	30%	49%	3%	12%	3%
	S	35%	60%	0	0	5%
	F	24%	74%	0	0	0

* O = Orange County, S = Sacramento and F = Fresno.

Note 1: The instructions guiding completion of the rate were:

"Please check whichever best reflects what attendance at the Career Counseling Workshop has led you to do. Use Column A to say that you have tried the practice or idea already, Column B to say that you think the idea or practice is promsing and you plan to try it, Column C to indicate you believe the practice is not useful for your school, Column D to indicate you don't recall the practice or idea, and Column E to state you missed its presentation."

TABLE 6 (cont.)

Activity		Col A (have tried)	Col B (will try)	Col C (not useful)	Col D (don't recall)	Col E (missed pre-entation)
10. Employ some of the career infusion ideas from the packet of ideas given your team.	O	9%	76%	12%	0	3%
	S	25%	65%	0	5%	0
	F	11%	89%	0	0	5%
11. Apply some of the career infusion ideas recommended by guest presenter.	O	21%	67%	12%	0	3%
	S	20%	75%	0	0	5%
	F	13%	87%	0	0	0
12. Use references or tests from the Career Skills Assessment Program distributed at workshop.	O	9%	58%	12%	9%	3%
	S	0	65%	5%	20%	5%
	F	3%	76%	11%	3%	3%
13. Try out ideas and practices suggested by John Rothrock.	O	24%	70%	6%	0	0
	S	0	45%	20%	25%	5%
	F	16%	71%	5%	5%	0
14. Conduct a community-educator interface panel similar to one at workshop for staff and parents at your school in order to promote cooperation.	O	12%	46%	36%	0	3%
	S	0	65%	25%	5%	5%
	F	21%	50%	18%	3%	0
15. Follow up one or more leads from community-educator interface panel.	O	24%	70%	6%	0	0
	S	5%	75%	10%	5%	5%
	F	13%	81%	0	0	3%
16. Use self-awareness exercises which were presented at the workshop.	O	21%	64%	0	6%	3%
	S	10%	80%	5%	5%	0
	F	24%	61%	5%	3%	0
17. Arrange field trip similar to one in workshop for staff or students. (For Sacramento workshop only.)	O	0	0	0	0	0
	S	10%	50%	25%	10%	0
	F	0	0	0	0	0
18. Have colleagues or students rate importance of school meeting Flanagan's 15 values, as presented in notebook and workshop.	O	0	61%	18%	18%	0
	F	0	50%	15%	30%	5%
	S	37%	11%	37%	0	0
19. Have students in your school go through some of the decision-making exercises presented in workshop.	O	27%	70%	0	0	0
	S	20%	70%	10%	0	0
	F	16%	79%	2%	0	0
20. Adapt activities for your career program which you learned about from participants on other teams.	O	15%	67%	12%	0	6%
	S	10%	70%	10%	0	0
	F	5%	90%	2%	0	0
21. Maintain ongoing professional relationship with workshop participants from other schools.	O	15%	61%	21%	0	0
	S	20%	65%	15%	0	0
	F	8%	90%	0	0	0

Dr. Markert opened the session by apologizing for the mixup in directions and reviewing the agenda. Then John Rothrock presented a module describing the exemplary career guidance program at Huntington Beach High School. He highlighted the career folder, teachers' roles, community involvement, and the handling of special populations. He closed by inviting participants to visit his program.

Dr. Markert then recommended that the teams spend the remaining hour in team planning. When one team suggested breaking, everyone enthusiastically agreed.

After lunch Dr. Michael Dillon, a counselor at CSUS, delivered a module on the Strong Campbell Interest Inventory and the function of tests. Each participant received a profile of his or her SCII scores. Dr. Dillon explained the meaning of the scores on the Profile and answered questions about the SCII. He then described a general counseling model within which he uses the SCII and other psychological tests. This model was derived from existentialist-humanistic psychology.

Day Four

Day Four was held at McClellan Air Force Base. Maps, parking area, and all physical arrangements were well prepared. The session was designed as an opportunity for workshop participants to interact with the largest employer in Sacramento (McClellan has 10,000 civilian employees) and expand their own awareness (and programs) through this interaction.

The morning session was held in the NCO club. Participants sat at dining tables and were served coffee and doughnuts--compliments of the Base. Colonel Mize, Personnel Director, organized the proceedings with the assistance of Drs. Weissman and Jenkins, who participated in the day's activities.

Base Commander General Lowe welcomed the workshop participants and expressed enthusiasm for the kind of activity in which they were engaged. Colonel Mize then moderated the morning presentation, a panel consisting of eight Division Directors. Each panelist spoke (10-20) minutes of their occupational area, describing their division's function on the Base, the type of occupations involved, the number of employees, training requirements, etc. Each presenter utilized visuals to supplement their talk.

After a break, Colonel Mize divided the panelists into four sections of the room and directed the workshop participants to rotate around these four sections, spending 15 minutes at each. This small-group process facilitated lively interaction as participants were able to dialogue more personally with the panelists, some of whom were joined by other supervisors in their areas.

During lunch, which was served in the dining room at modest prices, Drs. Weissman and Jenkins reviewed the day's activities with the participants. As ROP coordinator in the district, Dr. Jenkins emphasized the role McClellan AFB plays in hiring students and in linking up with various vocationally oriented programs. He spoke, too, of the points to look at during the afternoon field trips to the different job sites.

Colonel Mize, who organized the field trips then dispatched participants to the occupational areas of their interest. Military buses brought them to and

from these sites. They went in groups of three, each group to a different work site, and they were met by a foreman or supervisor. Each demonstrator was gracious and enthusiastic. They appeared to enjoy talking about their work and were responsive to questions.

After the field visits, Drs. Jenkins and Markert facilitated a debriefing session. Several participants voiced enthusiasm about the day. Some indicated that they had no idea so many jobs were available at McClellan. Some indicated they hoped to have some follow up as a result of the contact. Colonel Mize thanked everyone for his participation and reiterated his hope that the Base will continue this type of interfacing with the schools. He pointed out that this was the first program of its type that they had had.

Day Five

In order to expose participants to a career center, the fifth day occurred at Sacramento City College Career Center. Dr. Markert welcomed everyone back to the workshop, previewed the day's agenda, and introduced the four panelists. First Sam Spade began with a description of a Mobil Career Guidance unit he coordinates in the San Juan Unified School District. In operation two years, this traveling guidance unit features self-assessment surveys, group discussion, skill building and resume preparation. Questions concerned funding, curriculum articulation, and scheduling.

Sharon Strauss followed with a description of counseling services and programs at SCC. She underscored the detrimental effects caused by recent budget cuts.

Harold Webb next described the vocational counseling programs at UC Davis, supplementing his talk by distributing a booklet prepared by the Placement Center at Davis. Following this, Todd Lee described the counseling services at California State University, Sacramento.

In closing the morning, Dr. Paul Peters lectured on the Career Education Incentive Act, encouraging teams to begin early in writing proposals.

At. noon the group moved to a conference room in the Counseling Center and watched "Voyage of Discovery." Dr. Don Johnson arranged this showing and helped facilitate a discussion following it. The film introduced a series, and it emphasized that a career is a journey. As such, one can determine one's direction and discover, not only the world, but oneself in traveling along. Dr. Sorenson raised the issue of evaluation, asking the participants what the observer was supposed to learn from watching this film. He emphasized the importance of such questions in selecting guidance activities.

After lunch, Mr. George Montgomery demonstrated self-awareness techniques. He engaged the audience continuously with questions and activities, having them join him in constructing the lesson as it unfolded. With a brainstorming-type technique, Mr. Montgomery pointed out that self-awareness in career decision making develops in the same anner as self-awareness in any decision process, except that it may be more focused.

Day Six

Returning to the starting place, the workshop closed at the Sacramento State University Student Union. Dr. Nina Krebs and a colleague from the Center for Family, Individual and Organization Development delivered a module on combatting

TABLE 7

Percentage of Respondents Satisfied with Different Aspects of the Spring Workshops

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The purposes of this workshop were clear to me.	O	35%	53%	9%	3%	0
	S	11%	39%	22%	11%	11%
	F	43%	46%	6%	6%	0
2. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topics presented.	O	35%	56%	6%	0	0
	S	17%	61%	22%	0	0
	F	40%	51%	9%	0	0
3. Possible solutions to my problems were considered.	O	19%	47%	9%	9%	2%
	S	17%	28%	39%	11%	6%
	F	0	70%	12%	6%	3%
4. I have no guide for future action.	O	0	14%	13%	28%	44%
	S	0		6%	7%	72%
	F	3%	3%	9%	52%	32%
5. We worked together as a group.	O	50%	44%	3%	3%	0
	S	11%	67%	11%	11%	0
	F	30%	32%	9%	6%	3%
6. The materials in the notebook for individual participants were useful to me personally.	O	32%	52%	7%	7%	0
	S	11%	47%	30%	12%	0
	F	32%	52%	10%	6%	0
7. The team notebook was helpful in our planning.	O	10%	52%	13%	19%	3%
	S	6%	35%	47%	6%	6%
	F	26%	48%	19%	6%	0

TABLE 8

Reactions to Selected Presentations in Spring Workshops

Fresno

Module	Usefulness Not	Some	Very	Interest None	Some	High	N
Self Awareness - Healy	13%	66%	21%	0	68%	32%	26
Decision making - Griffith	14%	43%	43%	9%	48%	43%	21
Career infusion - Ceres	0	15%	85%	0	15%	85%	20
Exemplary program - Rothrock	0	25%	75%	0	16%	84%	32
Model plans - Healy	12%	59%	29%	6%	47%	47%	17
Placement panel	8%	42%	50%	4%	38%	58%	26
Elkhorn case - Griffith	0	46%	54%	8%	38%	54%	13
Problem-solving - Healy	0	61%	39%	6%	56%	39%	18

Sacramento

Module	Usefulness Not	Some	Very	Interest None	Some	High	N
Self Awareness - Montgomery	0	20%	80%	0	13%	87%	15
Evaluation - Healy	52%	45%	3%	52%	29%	23%	32
SCII Interpretation - Dillon	11%	33%	56%	0	56%	44%	9
Infusion - Pequeno	0	19%	81%	0	8%	92%	26
Exemplary program - Rothrock	0	20%	80%	0	20%	80%	10
Placement panel	19%	56%	25%	13%	44%	44%	16
Sex equity - Krebs	18%	27%	55%	18%	18%	64%	22

Orange County

Module	Usefulness Not	Some	Very	Interest None	Some	High	N
Exemplary program - Rothrock	0	30%	70%	0	9%	91%	33
Quality of Life - Sorenson	3%	38%	59%	3%	36%	62%	39
Problem-solving - Sorenson	3%	30%	68%	8%	30%	62%	37
Infusion - Isbell	13%	38%	50%	13%	25%	63%	8
Decision-making - Cook	0	0	100%	0	0	100%	19
Evaluation - Healy	9%	68%	18%	14%	64%	18%	22

bias. The presentation assisted participants in analyzing their own biases, particularly biases regarding the role of women at the workplace. The presenter began with a brainstorming activity in which participants listed typical adjectives used to characterize males and females. She then divided the group into several small groups and gave each a topic to discuss (e.g., the disadvantages/advantages of traditional stereotypes for men and women) and had the groups report on their discussion. She followed with two more consciousness raising activites.

After a break, the teams evaluated the workshop and reported on their progress. The teams described the objectives they had established for the coming year, the steps they had taken to assess their individual guidance programs, and the attempts they had made to involve more faculty in the planning process. One team presented a proposal they had completed to expand their guidance program and indicated ways in which the workshop contributed to the development of this proposal.

Attendance for the Six Sessions was as follows:

45, 38, 27, 30, 25, 22

Orange County Workshop

Table 6 presents the ratings of the 33 participants who attended the fourth and final Orange County workshop and who supplied usable data. It shows that the large majority were positive about the workshop and individual notebook and team notebook instructional material. Comments confirmed the positive feelings and noted some disappointments about not having all questions answered, more methods of decision making, more methods which could be used with students, and help with particular counseling skills.

Table 7, in turn, shows that a majority believed all key activities or ideas in the workshop were worth trying. Again, most had not yet tried the activities but rather intended to try them. Since there had only been three school weeks between the first and last two sessions, it isn't reasonable to expect more try out.

Day One

The first session began forty-minutes late, due to a severe thunderstorm that delayed the arrival of several participants. The slow start forced Dr. Sorenson to shorten his presentation so that the teams could break for lunch on schedule.

Dr. Markert began the session by welcoming the participants, thanking them for their patience, and introducing the staff. He then introduced the first presenter, Dr. Stan Greene. Dr. Greene described the purpose of the project and presented an overview of materials and objectives. He asked each team to write their own expectations of the workshop on a 5 x 8 card. He then summarized these and pointed out the similarities between the participants' expectations and the objectives of the workshop. Dr. Greene's enthusiasm, humor, use of visuals, and personal style (he engaged several participants by name) created a relaxed but task-oriented mood. Participants were able to focus their own purposes (team

expectation activity) for being there and see how these purposes matched the direction of the workshop. Though they did not engaged in an extended discussion, the participants seemed content.

Dr. Sorenson followed with a lecture-discussion on the relationship between goals and planning. He focused on the Flanagan Study as an illustration of important educational goals and a means of establishing them. The participants appeared attentive during this presentation but did not engage in extended discussion. Dr. Sorenson then had each team work on the Flanagan Survey and report their three priorities. At the request of one of the teams, he listed the entire group's priorities on the board. Because of the shortened schedule, the teams could not complete the Flanagan exercise nor follow it with much discussion.

Dr. Sorenson suggested a brief coffee break, after which he presented the various steps involved in planning a program. He referenced his essay on planning and summarized its main points. He then described the major elements of a program--e.g., needs assessment, goals, strategies, evaluation procedures.

Mr. John Rothrock described the Huntington Beach High School Advisory program during the afternoon session. He distributed materials, spoke enthusiastically, and outlined different aspects of this comprehensive career guidance system. The audience was generally quiet throughout this presentation but asked questions and made comments after it.

Day Two

Dr. Garth Sorenson introduced the concept of problem-solving counseling and outlined on the blackboard a grid-format which teachers/counselors might use to identify and record student problems. He then had participants read and respond to the Joe Taylor exercise. The instruction followed the logical sequence of presenting an idea, showing a technique applying this idea, engaging participants in an activity based upon the idea. It evoked considerable response--including some disagreement--from the participants. Although Dr. Sorenson didn't relate the counseling approach specifically to career counseling, he mentioned how it could be used for career-related problems.

Following this module, Mr. Don Isbell delivered an organized, multimedia (audio, handouts, worksheets, simulation) presentation on infusion. He was enthusiastic, provided a variety of learning modes, and evoked considerable participation. Besides presenting some basic information about career education, he pointed out key career education concepts and illustrated ways these concepts could be infused in the classroom. He involved six participants in a mock parent conference that illustrated the importance of career guidance for the potential dropout student and its relevance to classroom activities. He also taught participants how to develop an infusion lesson.

After lunch Drs. Swan, Sorenson and Markert were scheduled to consult with teams as they began to establish preliminary plans for their school guidance programs. This was the first formal planning session of the workshop. Rather than have the teams use this time for their individual planning, however, Drs. Swan, Sorenson and Markert agreed that Dr. Swan would conduct a general discussion. Dr. Swan made a few introductory comments about the difficulties of trying to initiate large-scale changes and then had each team report what their goals were and the problems they were having. He then commented upon

these remarks, sharing his experience and caveats relevant to career education. Dr. Swan ended the session by cautioning them to plan small and selectively and to be ready next session to share their first steps and problems. Time ran out before the participants could confer with their teammates, and the staff omitted collecting their team progress reports.

Day Three

Dr. Markert moderated the Community Interface Panel. Five individuals--all but one from the public sector--addressed the group on community resources available to school career guidance programs. Interest seemed high, as each team had individuals asking questions and reacting to the panelists' remarks. Mr. Sol Tomberg, the panelist representing the Apprenticeship Program of the California State Department of Industrial Relations, received and answered the majority of questions in this session. He was a dynamic, informative speaker. The fact that the IBM representative did not appear for the panel and the select involvement of Bell and Howell with educational programs limited the teams' chances of getting involved with private industry as a result of this panel.

After the coffee break, during which time the participants spoke informally with the panelists, the teams convened for a formal planning session. Dr. Healy outlined the components of a career guidance plan, introduced the Team Progress Sheets and then asked teams to work on their plans and discuss with him and consultants Drs. Markert and Swan, specific concerns which they were having in establishing or implementing their plans.

Since the teams did not have an opportunity to plan with a staff consultant or fill a Team Progress Sheet on Day Two, some felt lost about where and how to start planning. Other teams, notably Anaheim, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Glendale focused clearly on setting up a team guidance effort.

After lunch Dr. Swan shared a number of career guidance materials (books, references, handouts) with the group. He spoke about the various resources and circulated them among the teams. He stated that self-assessment was the foremost stage in career Planning and that the materials might be useful in the teams' efforts to build self-asessment components in their programs. Dr. Healy supplemented this presentation by distributing the College Board Career Skills Assessment Kits and underscoring their value as a resource.

Dr. Paul Peters then spoke about the Career Education Incentive Act. The group was attentive during this presentation. Many stayed until 4:20 to ask additional questions.

Day Four

Mrs. Pat Cook began the day with a presentation that mentioned many aspects of career planning counseling. She was organized and inspirational. Her use of an outline, many handouts, and various counseling techniques were appreciated by the audience. The many questions asked encouraged her to go beyond the time alloted.

Thrown behind schedule by the decision making presentation, Dr. Healy shortened his presentation on evaluation. He introduced the concept briefly, emphasizing it as a monitoring and feedback process not unlike everyday

processes with which people are already familiar. He then engaged the participants in a team activity designed to have teams identify the criterion specific audiences might use to determine the effectiveness (value) of a specific instructional activity. Reactions to this exercise indicated participants understood the concepts being taught. The second exercise sought to teach formative evaluation. It was more complicated and required more time to introduce and more time to complete than was available. As a result, some teams showed confusion in their inability to do this exercise. The teams followed this presentation by filling out evaluation forms of the workshop itself.

After lunch each team shared with the group where they were in their own planning and the concerns and frustrations they were having in order to help teams recognize their progress, to allow them to hear from and respond to each other, and to give our staff a sense of where the teams were.

Anaheim volunteered to present first, realizing that they were farther along than the others. Their account of their own evolution, of the problems they faced and solutions they worked out, seemed appreciated by other teams in the workshop. A sense of realism seemed to dominate their presentation. Glendale and other districts followed with other promising plans.

Attendance for this workshop was as follows: 41 participants at the first meeting, 38 at the second, 34 at the third and 30 at the final meeting. Facilities were excellent. The fact that all meetings were held at the same site, with convenient freeway access and ample parking, contributed to the operation of the workshop. The Site Coordinator, Mr. Jim Curley, arranged these facilities through Mr. Dan Holut, Principal of Gwen Foss Elementary School.

Fresno Workshop

The Fresno Workshop was delivered in the attractive Counseling Center at Fresno City College. The president's introduction, coffee and the comfortable facilities, the accessible parking and cafeteria contributed to the success of the workshop.

Table 6 shows the overall reaction to the workshop. The large majority of respondents reported satisfaction. In terms of follow through, the majority intended to try, and in a few cases, had already tried the workshop elements they had seen. Although some did not judge that a community resource panel would fit their schools, they believed that interaction with the panel helped them.

In terms of presentation, Tabe 8 shows the participant ratings. These are amplified by staff comments in the description of the workshop which follows.

Day One

The Fresno Workshop followed the prepared agenda closely. It was launched by Dr. Stan Greene, the State Department of Education monitor of the project. He gave the opening address to the 48 people attending the first session. His speech was designed to give control of the workshop to the participants, making them feel that what they received from the workshop would depend on

the effort they put forth. He outlined both of the books which would be used, highlighting those parts of special importance. Lastly, he had all of the schools write down what they hoped to get out of the workshop, and then compared these to what the UCLA program wished for them to receive. In all cases the goals were overlapping, which reassured the participants that they were in the right place.

Dr. Charles Healy followed with a presentation of a model of career guidance and also how to conduct a needs assessment in a school or community using all resources available (teachers, counselors, administrators, students and community). The participants attended well to the presentation, giving comments when asked and contributing to a general discussion of the points presented. While the number of comments were not large, they did convey the fact that the people understood the presentation.

Next, the participants met in their teams to discuss preliminary steps which they should and would take to implement the model of career guidance. The remarks of the participants and the actions they planned to take gave the impression that they understood what was expected and felt they could get some of the ideas put into practice soon. Limited time presented the staff from helping all the teams in formulating plans, and these schools later had more trouble than those with whom the staff met, probably due to the inability to ask questions of staff as they planned. One of the specific problems for teams without administrators was who to contact first in the school to receive the most help. Another problem was getting the aid of teachers, especially those who do not see vocational education as being important.

After lunch, John Rothrock from Edison High School in the Huntington Beach Unified School District (BUSD) gave a presentation of an exemplary program in career guidance. His talk seemed interesting, as he was continually interrupted with questions from the audience about the plausibility of his (Rothrock's) program working in the Fresno schools. Many questions were also directed toward the career folder used in HBUSD. Some participants even waited until after the presentation to talk to John about specific parts of the HBUSD program and how John could further aid them in their guidance programs.

Overall, the day appeared to be a successful start to the workshop, as the teams contributed to presentations, they were given a variety of presenters, and they had time to chat with one another and make plans. The large majority (16) of the teams were exactly that--teams--so they had people with whom to discuss plans instead of having to wait to get back to their respective schools for discussion.

Day Two

Dr. Healy opened the second day of the workshop with a presentation on problem-solving career counseling using the practice problem solving case of "Joe Taylor." This exercise served as a focus for the teams, citing examples which most could relate to but leaving answers up for discussion among the group. The solutions to the problems were to be arrived at by each team as they related to individual schools. During the discussion period (about 25 minutes), the staff moved among the teams to answer questions and also listened to get an understanding of what sort of people made up the school population. The

comments made ("This sounds like Tom;" "We have the same types of kids"), suggested that the majority of participants followed the presentation and profited from it.

Mr. Roger Perry and Bill Foster followed with a description of career infusion concepts and lessons. Participants especially enjoyed partaking in two high school English or social studies infusion exercises involving identifying occupational adjectives from a news magazine. Responses which could be collected indicated high satisfaction, as Table 8 shows.

After lunch, Dr. Griffiths guided the participants in sharing views about the Elkhorn case and the applicability of problem solving to team development as envisioned in the workshop. Participant response was very favorable as shown in Table 8. Staff, likewise, believed that Dr. Griffiths' efforts had helped participants recognize the application of problem solving to team building. As intended, the presentation moved participants into team caucusing in order to complete the planning progress sheet. In the first author's view, this fittingly underscored the team building purpose of the workshop.

Overall, the two days seemed on target. Second day attendance was similar to the first (46). Arrangements were made to mail out team books and individual books to those not receiving them because of the larger-than-expected registration.

Day Three

The Community Resources Panel was the first module held on this day. Carefully assembled by Mr. Atamian, it consisted of eight people in various professions who discussed what they look for when hiring new people. Workshop participants were surprised to hear that many of the skills desired a decade or more ago (writing, reading, communication) are still necessary today. In addition to typical needs, the Fresno City councilman highlighted the disadvantage of minorities and the need for educators to offer special help. Each panelist gave a ten-minute presentation which was followed by a couple of questions from the audience. After all panelists had spoken, discussion was opened up to all for questions. While individuals were singled out for questions, other panelists were encouraged to, and did, give their answers to the questions. Workshop participants asked many questions, with some expressing an interest in having some of the speakers come to their schools and speak to the faculty and students.

A team planning session was held during the middle portion of the day. During this time the team members were able to discuss and write down areas of vocational education where work was needed and plan accordingly. The plans ranged anywhere from having a community panel to eliciting teacher help in infusion. One particular school drew up a list of teachers, administrators and students to talk to for the expressed interest of moving the career center to a more central place on campus. Another team concerned itself with starting a career area in the library, as the librarian was a member of the team and believed he knew more about what was needed and how to get it than anyone else on the faculty. The library was considered because there is no career center, or room for one, on that campus.

The afternoon session consisted of two one-hour presentations. The first was given by Dr. Griffiths about decision making strategies. Responses were

elicited from the participants after some examples were given. Dr. Griffiths pointed out that solutions to one school's problems are not necessarily going to work in another school, so it is the process of decision making which is important. Attention was good, although the presentation was hurried due to time constraints. It was noted that some propositions on decision making were in the team binder and that members should refer to those for help.

Paul Peters of the California Department of Education spoke for the remaining time on the Career Incentive Act and how to receive funding. This, in a sense, was a mini-workshop on proposals, with the major points being that there is money to get for projects, that many proposals are not long or time-consuming, and that those schools in the room had a jump on other schools which were not participating. Dr. Healy interjected that he would be available to help in the proposal writing; in fact, he made a strong pitch for these schools to submit proposals for consideration. Dr. Peters offered his assistance at any time, so some schools expected to call him after reading the handout.

Overall the day kept the attention of the majority of the 40 participants, as few left before 4:00 p.m.

Day Four

The final day of the Fresno workshops began with a placement panel made up of members from the Fresno City College Counseling Staff. Forty-one participants were in attendance. The presentations included orientation, job placement, scholarships and financial aid, and career planning and the Eureka Computer System. Since many students in the Fresno area high schools attend Fresno City College, the information was necessary to the participants for their work with the high schools. Some of the members of teams used the Eureka System and then expressed an interest in sharing a hook-up with a couple of near-by schools. The panelists were good contacts for later on and said they would always be willing to meet with any students thinking about the community college system.

Dr. Healy gave a short presentation on self-awareness strategies, mentioning the activities which are in use today and available to high school students and counselors. He also used his Can of Squirms, passing the can around for everyone to pick out one of the papers. This exercise kept the participants' attention, as the responses to the written papers in the can were lively and varied. The team members were also sure to copy down addresses of the publishing companies which are leaders in vocational education materials.

Mr. Dave Robertson and Mr. Charles Fox from two Fresno high schools talked and answered questioned for 30 minutes on the programs at their schools. The participants were pleased to hear these speakers, as the ideas were presented by some of their own. These two gentlemen offered to help out the participating schools in any way they could, hoping to help schools by-pass problems which they had already experienced and solved.

Dr. Healy spoke briefly on evaluation. He expressed the strong need for evaluation methods to be devised before starting programs and to keep it as an ongoing process. Formative and summative methods were mentioned and reference was made to the Notes on Evaluation in the team binder. There were few questions at the conclusion of the presentation, perhaps because of being late for lunch.

After lunch, each team presented their up-to-date plans with the hope of receiving aid from the other schools. Some plans were more comprehensive than others, just as some schools had wide-ranging programs, while others were only beginning. The progressive schools were able to lend assistance and similar schools were able to hear each other and help each other out, if not then, at a later date. Also, the grade nine and senior high schools could hear what each was expecting from the other. For these reasons interest seemed high throughout the presentations.

Summary and Conclusions about Participant/Staff Evaluations of Technical Learning

At the end of the workshop responding participants, probably those more partial to the workshop than nonrespondents, reported relatively high satisfaction and the intention of trying out the major ideas and practices presented in the workshop. Examination of reactions to individual instructional components, which were obtained immediately and from a less partial audience, at least in the early sessions, confirm that the participants were satisfied and viewed the presentations as offering useful ideas/and practices.

It is the staff and writers' opinion which tends to be confirmed by inspection of presentation ratings, that the participants preferred simple, practitioner presentations of concrete practices. They especially liked handouts that could easily be fit into portions of a class. They were less enthusiastic about conceptual presentations by university professors, and many did not do preparatory reading for such presentations. Surprisingly, many participants dismissed the need for conceptualizing career development as an educational goal and judging whether particular guidance practices should replace or augment traditional educational activities.

Attendance

The project reached only 231 of the 400 educators it sought, and about 10 of these attended to observe limited aspects of the project. We initiated six instead of the projected five workshops. Two started in the fall in Los Angeles, but these were merged to conserve resources for a Spring, afternoon workshop. We tried to attract L.A. City School teams which could not obtain released time during school days to that workshop. Unfortunately, it did not draw enough participants to hold. The three originally planned workshops were conducted in the Spring; one in Sacramento, one in Orange County and one in Fresno.

Attendance stayed above 80% at the four Fresno meetings and above 75% at the four Orange meetings. It dropped, however, below 65% after the second day in Sacramento and below 65% on the sixth day in Los Angeles. Throughout

the Los Angeles workshops, Saturdays drew 20% to 25% fewer participants than Fridays. Attendance by session was reported in the workshop narratives, and total attendance is reported in the required statistical sheet later in this report.

Growth in Career Maturity

Analysis of the pre-post Career Growth Index scores for the 37 Los Angeles and 33 Fresno participants who turned in scorable indices showed that the L.A. group had increased their scores significantly at the .05 level over the three-month period, whereas there was no significant difference between the pre-post Fresno scores over the month between administrations. Unfortunately, divergent views about evaluation by staff and consultant prevented collecting post test CGIs in Sacramento, and staff in the Orange workshop forgot to pick up the CGI.

These findings are the predictable ones. The longer Los Angeles workshop, which even included directions about an autobiography and permitted more exchange about appropriate career goals and strategies for creating careers, should have bolstered career maturity and have enabled participants to take actions to develop their careers more than the Fresno workshop which offered less stimulation and time to act.

DISCREPANCIES FROM PROJECT GOALS

Planning

Four task forces approached planning and launching comprehensive interdisciplinary career guidance programs during the course of the project. The inability to assist more teams reach such a level of readiness stemmed from at least the following five factors, not necessarily weighted in their order of importance.

Overambitious - this objective was too ambitious for the time duration and for the limited resources allocated for each team. Exemplary, task force-guided programs in the Huntington Beach and Ceres districts evolved over several years and were supported by substantial grants. Our expectation that educators of varying backgrounds, expertise in career development and knowledge of one another could coalesce into a task force that would agree upon meaningful goals, select a limited number of strategies, lobby administrators, faculty, students, and community for its adoption, and try out a program within a few months was unrealistic in terms of what other task forces have achieved. Although the first author's success with Project Cadre (Healy-Quinn, 1977) in establishing task forces for leading district inservice efforts in career development infusion indicated that task forces could be established relatively quickly through workshops, the task forces of Project Cadre had a simpler, more concrete task--directing the district's or school's inservice in career development infusion, and the participating teams were more clear about their purpose and had more assurance that they could achieve it. In that project more and higher ranking administrators enrolled.

How Teams Develop - there was not enough direction and time on task force development for the participants to complete coalescence. To become a task force member requires adopting the stance of educational leader, planner, and collaborator. Educators must look beyond their individual instructional duties and accept responsibility for prioritizing a school's career guidance objectives and winning administration and faculty endorsement of those goals. To accomplish these tasks we have thought that educators must inform themselves about career development, their students' guidance needs, and feasible, valid strategies for assisting students. Then they must persuade decision makers at their school to support particular career guidance efforts. It is not enough for task force members to find out what colleagues are doing and to learn about some guidance

techniques that might fit into their current teaching or counseling program.

Career guidance program leader, planner, and collaborator were new roles for many of the participants, requiring them to adopt new psychological sets. In the initial eight-day L.A. workshops, the first sessions overviewed career guidance, afforded participants time to discuss priorities with teammates, and explicated the nature of these new roles. Then it directed teams to meet, and it enabled project staff to clarify the members' roles. Although team development was subsequently addressed through the Elkhorn case, a trouble shooting presentation (L.A. only), the evaluation presentation and final team presentation, all of these efforts were on Saturday in Los Angeles or on afternoons elsewhere. Hence many participants missed them, or the desire to get home precluded developing the implications of these presentations for program planning.

Finally, ambiguity about the process of becoming a task force made it difficult for teams to monitor their own progress and to take corrective action as obstruction occurred. It also interfered with our staff's acting systematically to bolster teams who were stumbling.

From observing task forces in our project it seems that task force development involves the following steps. These are not necessarily stages, since they may be reversible, several may be in process at once, and they are not necessarily sequential.

1. A team's members accepted the charge of working toward an interdisciplinary program. The continuing members acknowledged that career guidance goals were worthy of their effort and were consonant with their professional identity.
2. A team's members convinced themselves that they could perform a meaningful service and that their recommendation would command action. In other words, the team affirmed that it would influence people.
3. The team organized for action and continuation. Roles were delineated and accepted, either through formal assignment or group concensus. Agenda started to be set and objectives with time lines and persons designated to act were created. This step seemed to be well along when the team designed a structure which they were ready to present to superiors.
4. The team members looked for activities/strategies which would fit a collaborative effort. This search also helped to crystalize

the emerging organization as described in step three. Teammates talked about the activities as representing a team thrust which might be used by different members rather than in terms of how individuals would use them. They asked each other how they could cooperate.

5. The team agreed upon a set of activities for one or more goals that they would coordinate. This sometimes involved only informing teammates about particular practices, or it may have involved formal delineation of alternatives for students to use in accomplishing objectives within a student planning folder. Agreements about program sometimes started with task analysis; that is, by identifying goals and then earmarking activities for them. More often, however, it proceeded from identifying agreeable activities which could be linked to objectives and assuring that the activities weren't repeated.
6. The team members took responsibility to try out or sponsor existing activities.
7. The teams considered how to improve and evaluate their instructional efforts. They were not concerned with formulating evaluation goals or plans at the outset of instructional planning. They did not formally attend to judging their progress in team development. By this step they were interested in asking how well their activities were working.

Had we as clear a delineation of the steps in task force coalescence at the outset, we would have shared it with teams and joined them in working on the steps. Lack of understanding about team creation in education, of course, both justifies a project such as ours and makes it very challenging.

Too Many Ideas - the scope of the workshop hindered rather than contributed to task force development. Although the presentations introduced many ideas and practices, their number limited the amount of time available for participants to plan and to confer with project staff and consultants. Often the presentations had the limelight, relegating participants to the passive receiver role rather than to the interactive, doer-planner role envisaged in the proposal. Rarely had presenters time to explain how the ideas and activities of their presentation related to a task force's charge, not just an individual's interest in a technique. Indeed, the emphasis of the presentations on ideas and skills pertinent to counseling and teaching kept these roles prominent and distracted the participants from the leader-planner-collaborator role which is essential for a task force member to adopt. Finally, late starts

and presentation overruns reduced planning time allocations during the workshops, and may well have unintentionally implied that planning was unimportant.

Participant Expectations - the participant wants, the occupational composition of the teams, and the motivation of the members did not full support task force creation. Unfortunately, time and resources constraints prevented sending staff to meet with each participating team before or during the workshop to orient participants about roles. Surprisingly, many participants did not know about the recruitment materials or the orientation delineating the workshop's focus on task force teams. In several cases, the team representative who signed up a school did not join the team. Clearly, future workshop providers should confer with all attendees beforehand in order to clarify expectations and obligations of both parties. Mutual contracts would have helped correct motivation and attendance problems in this workshop.

At least initially, many participants apparently wanted a smorgasbord of career guidance ideas and practices for teachers and counselors. They applauded such presentations, while rating overviews or conceptual presentations less favorably. Many weren't concerned about delineating what career development in adolescence entailed. They did not ask questions one would expect of leaders, planners, and collaborators. From the start in PROJECT Cadre, for example, participants initiated discussions about how one could justify diverting several hours of subject matter instruction to career development activities, the evidence beyond the originator's testimony for particular practices, of their long term significance, of how one could coordinate career guidance activities to prevent repetition. In contrast, in this project, almost all the questions in the first half of the current workshops were of the "how can I do the technique" genre. Fortunately, toward the end some participants were asking about priorities, plans, ways of continuing and augmenting their task forces, and networking.

Inauspicious year - 1979-80 was not a year for innovation in California education. Proposition 13 and the specter of Proposition 9 moved educators into a holding , "wait and see" posture. Several of the participants, indeed, indicated that their employment was not secure, and many were skeptical about the possibility of change during the "siege period" wherein education found itself.

Technical Learning.

Although the large majority of the participants evaluating were satisfied with the workshops and reported that nearly all presentations were at least somewhat interesting and useful, and although many indicated that they would try most of the activities and ideas highlighted at the workshop, the project did not establish the participants' level of mastery. Three factors account for this, not necessarily weighted as they appear below.

First, the staff could not create, agree upon, and modify instructional materials as quickly as needed. This delayed producing many of the mastery test exercises in time for the workshops.

Second, we found that Los Angeles participants became noticeably anxious when tested with relatively easy items. The information yield, however, was minimal. Although the large majority scored more than 80%, there was not a pattern with errors to suggest weaknesses in particular areas and the competence assessed was not far beyond what would be expected of those uninitiated in career guidance.

Third, the fact that many participants relied almost exclusively on a workshop's oral presentations made it senseless to examine them on ideas which required deliberation and discussion to master. Clearly several Los Angeles, Orange and Fresno participants stood out because they had carefully read and thought about the instructional materials, but this only underscored that many participants weren't reading. Not surprisingly, staff assistants were unable to collect even one of the content reading tests which the spring workshop participants were asked to complete.

In retrospect, the invitation and acceptance into the workshop should have made it clearer that extensive technical reading was expected between sessions. Contracts should have been made for such reading. Likewise, annotated references should have been provided in order for the participants who believed that they could obtain all of a teacher's useful ideas from one reading or presentation would have had alternate perspectives available. Furthermore, more time would have enabled all presenters to note the relevance of the instructional materials provided and to reference particular materials more often in their presentation.

Attendance

Overall enrollment was well below our expectation. The most likely reason was the "survival" or "wait and see" posture of California secondary and community college education in 1979-80. Other significant factors seem to be

shifting priorities away from career education to basic skills and the limited period available to generate commitment to such a project. Of lesser significance, was the late contacts with the Fresno, Orange and Sacramento prospective participants occasioned by the occupational redirection of the first coordinator. Contacts in September instead of November with Fresno, Orange and Sacramento might have elicited resource allocations for career guidance before they were committed elsewhere, although no district indicated our invitation was too late for them to accept.

The disappointing, diminishing attendance stemmed from several factors. Telephone calls to Los Angeles dropouts indicated that school reassignments, new priorities, ignorance of the obligation to attend all sessions, and conflicting schedules stopped several participants from continuing, whereas a few believed the workshop too elementary, and even a few judged it to be of low quality. Similar shifts in job duties, overload of duties, and perceived inappropriateness most probably produced the dropouts in the Sping sessions.

Clearly, some of the attendance problems could have been averted by a preworkshop meeting and completion of a written contract delineating attendance, evaluation, plan development, and reading requirements.

IMPROVED TEACHING

This section describes three instructional devices which are not often used and which were helpful in the project. The devices are the case study, the community panel, and the student career planning folder.

Case Study

We devoted a section of the career guidance workshops to teaching the participants problem solving concepts and strategies so that they could use those concepts in trouble shooting in their teams and in developing improved career guidance procedures in their own schools. To these ends, Dr. Sorenson created three case summaries and accompanying materials and tried them out on one or more groups of participants. He built the three cases upon actual counseling experiences, but altered them to conceal names, places, and institutions. One case summary described career counseling interviews with a student, and two described counseling staff difficulties.

The case studies are intended as part of an overall program to teach a rationale which includes a values framework, a theory of counseling, and a counseling technology (set of counseling procedures). The technology, when properly learned,presumably enables counselors to engage in four related sets of operations which together comprise counseling: (a) developing valid procedures for identifying those persons in a given population, e.g., a school or community, who are most in need of counseling; (b) discovering for a given client the probable reasons for that person's difficulties; (c) selecting or developing a treatment for alleviating those causes; (d) trying out, evaluating and revising that intervention to make it effective.

In order to be able to perform this operation, students learn a set of concepts, principles, rules and practice applying them to case materials.

The instructional case contains the following items. Appendix B presents an actual case.

1. A glossary which lists and defines the technical terms or concepts needed to understand the remainder of the material presented in the lesson.
2. A list of propositions, e.g., about the goals of counseling, methods by which the goals are to be achieved, and procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of counseling methods. The propositions comprise the theoretical framework underlying the cognitive model of counseling.

As will be apparent, two kinds of propositions are included: (a) ethical, for use in determining counseling goals, and (b) empirical, for determining which procedures are likely to be useful in achieving those goals.

3. An essay which presents the rationale for the lesson and explains why these propositions rather than alternatives are correct or pertinent--in other words, stating the argument for why counselors should understand and use the concepts and propositions presented in the lesson.
4. A brief case summary describing a fictional person and his or her problems. (The summaries should represent typical counseling cases.)
5. A list of questions about the case which require the counselor candidate correctly to apply the given concepts and principles to the information provided in the case, in order to get the right answers. A multiple choice question, for example, might require the students not only to indicate which alternative is correct, but also to indicate which item(s) of information embedded in the case summary together with which principle or rule make that alternative the correct choice.
6. An answer sheet to be used by the student in answer the questions.
7. A list of correct answers--the "school solution" to the questions.
8. A feedback procedure for (a) giving students information about their performance and (b) gathering information needed to clarify and otherwise improve the lesson.
9. A set of simple rating scales which enable students quickly to report the level of interest and level of difficulty of each of the exercises.
10. A discussion plan.

Generally we had to adapt our procedures because a substantial number of participants hadn't read the preparatory materials, and the variations in response to the exercises were even greater than we had anticipated. Nevertheless, partial evaluations of the results convinced us that these cases were useful instructional procedures although they required further development. We also believe that this kind of case approach elicits useful information about the participants. The following conclusions, while partly impressionistic, seem to warrant further investigation:

1. Most of the participants found the cases intrinsically interesting. There were lively discussions, requests for additional copies of the cases, etc. Many participants said the problems described in the

cases were to those they had encountered in their own schools.

2. Perhaps one half the participants recognized and approved of the idea that concepts, principles, and strategies (heuristics) that were helpful in solving problems in one situation might apply to similar problems in a different setting.
3. Some participants were extremely impatient with some of the more abstract aspects of these exercises. They saw parts of the exercises as too speculative, doubted that our rules were valid rules, and insisted that their own solutions, even when inconsistent with our rules, were as good as any.
4. As many as half the participants prefer only limited involvement in the problems of developing effective career guidance programs. They are willing to learn how to apply particular procedures, but don't want to think about issues such as the conditions under which the procedures should be applied or how they should be evaluated. They are particularly reluctant to take initiative in starting something that is new or different.
5. Some of the participants found the exercises at least mildly dicomforting. They had a variety of reasons. Some said that the cases were "too close to home" and made them feel uncomfortable. Some experienced "evaluation anxiety" such that they did not want to be pinned down or to record their answers to the questions. Often they refused to submit answer sheets for inspection.
6. A few participants were openly scornful of this instructional approach. It didn't entertain them as much as a film or demonstration. It required their attention and their considered response, whether they preferred to respond or not.
7. The participants apparently varied greatly in their ability to learn abstract concepts, and particularly in their ability to apply those concepts to actual situations. Judging from their performance in other parts of the workshop, this ability to apply concepts may not be closely related to skills such as ability to memorize and remember or to select ideas from several sources and organize them into a term paper.
8. Participants who were very good at presenting ideas, describing procedures, and getting things done were not as good at observing themselves or other people. For example, some who talked a lot about

the importance of empathy and open communication often were good "senders" but poor "receivers" of messages. It appeared that they were so busy thinking about what to say next, that they missed important cues, verbal and non-verbal.

9. People who came with firm ideas about what career guidance and career guidance workshops should be like were less tolerant of, and sympathetic with, the case approach than those who hadn't made up their minds.
10. In contrast, people whose perceptions had been shaped by experiences in the "real" world seemed to be more interested. They also appeared to get more from the case discussions than those whose knowledge of career guidance derived from reading.

Community Panel

Our project repeated use of the community panel for initiating education collaboration with community leaders in career education. Appendix C provides a rationale and guide to organizing and conducting the panel. Almost always both educators and community leaders like the opportunity of interfacing with one another. Several moderators have replicated this strategy successfully in several different locations in California and across the nation.

Student Career Planning Folder

Our project did not invent this device but instead helped to disseminate it. It is a simple aid but useful in giving the student control over, and responsibility for, his or her career development. In essence, the folder is a file folder on which the student makes entries and to which he/she has access.

The school and its students decide what entries to have. Typcially, there are sections for courses, school activities and sports, extra school and work experiences, plans for each semester and reflections about the past semester's plans, and results of ability, interest, and values tests and reflections about them. There may also be sections on completed career education courses, field experiences, counselor/advisor meetings, and reflections about them.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL TRAINING

PARTICIPANT SUMMARY FORM

1) Title of Project: Career Counseling Task Forces

2) Name and Address of District, College, or School: University of California
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90024

3) Name of Project Director and Title: Charles C. Healy, Co-Principal Investigator
A. Garth Sorenson, Co-Principal Investigator

4) Project Number: 19-30049-39504

5) Total Number of Participants (Unduplicated count): 231

6) Total Participant Hours (Total number of hours of conducted training actually attended and totaled for all participants): Los Angeles: 2760 Orange: 888 Sacramento: 1146 Fresno: 1080 = 5874 participant hours

Please Classify the Total Number of Participants by the Following Types:

7)

PARTICIPANTS	American Indian		Black		Chicano/ Hispanic		Oriental		White & All Others		TOTALS
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Teacher	2	1			6	1		1	27	24	62
Supervisor									2		2
Paraprofessional				2		3		1	1	6	13
Counselor	1		5	5	5	3	2		33	29	83
Administrator	1	1	3	2	3	1		1	29	16	57
Media Specialist											
County Staff									2	1	3
State Staff											
Other (Specify)			1 librarian		1 translator		1 unknown		5*	3 unknown	11
TOTALS	4	2	8	10	14	9	3	3	99	79	231

*1 trustee
*1 librarian
*3 unknown

8) LEVEL

Junior High ____ ROP/C ____ Community College 12
High School 46 Adult ____ Other (Specify) 3 four-year universities
1 Jobs Corps
1 Neighborhood Youth Corps
1 Special project

9) COMMUNITY

Urban 13 Suburban 42 Rural 9

10) On a separate sheet, please list all local educational agencies represented in training activities and the number of participants from each agency.

10) Name of School/Agency — No. of Participants

Los Angeles Workshop I

Artesia High School	3
Gahr High School	3
Calabasas High School	4
Leuzinger High School	6
Centinela Valley Unified School District	1
Garey High School	6
Glendora High School	3
Rowland High School	6
South Pasadena High School	7
Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools	2
Rio Hondo College	4
	45

Los Angeles Workshop II

Pioneer High School	4
St. Bernard High School	4
Salesian High School	4
South High (Torrance)	5
El Monte High School	2
Hacienda La Puente Unified School District	1
Walnut High School	2
Los Altos High School	3
Bishop Montgomery High School	6
Los Angeles High School	1
West Los Angeles College	3
Los Angeles Southwest College	3
Los Angeles Valley College	2
Los Angeles Mission College	2
East Los Angeles College	3
	45

Sacramento Workshop

Ponderosa High School	4
Elk Grove High School	5
Bella Vista High School	2
San Juan Unified School District	1
Valley High School	3
El Dorado High School	4
Carson Creek Junior/Senior High School	2
Sacramento City College	3
American River College	9
Sierra College	7
California State University, Sacramento	7
University of California, Davis	1
Sacramento Job Corps	2
	50

Name of School/Agency	No. of Participants
Orange County Workshop	
Anaheim High School	7
Estancia High School	3
Garden Grove High School	5
Garden Grove Unified School District	1
Glendale High School	6
Ocean View High School	3
J.F. Kennedy High School	1
Western High School	1
Cypress High School	1
Huntington Beach Union High School District	1
North Orange County Community College District	1
Rancho Santiago Community College	2
Saddleback College	6
Orange County Neighborhood Youth Corps	3
	41
Fresno Workshop	
Bullard High School	2
Clovis High School	3
Clovis West High School	3
DeWolf High School	3
Edison High School	3
Hamilton Freshman School	3
Hoover High School	3
McLane High School	4
McLane Continuation High School	1
Orosi High School	3
Parlier High School	4
Roosevelt High School	4
Sequoia Freshman High School	4
Sierra Freshman High School	3
Sierra Jt. Un. High School	1
	1
Fresno City College	4
California State University, Fresno	1
Kingsburn Plan	1
	50

TABLE 9

Summary of Member Characteristics

	L.A.(90)** *(N = 50)		Sacramento(50)** *(N = 34)		Orange(41)** *(N = 35)		Fresno(50)** *(N = 33)	
Age:	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
a) 35 and under	17	29.8	12	35.3	13	37.1	8	24.2
b) 36 - 45	20	35.1	13	38.2	16	45.7	8	24.2
c) 46 - 55	15	26.3	8	23.5	5	14.3	13	39.4
d) 56 +	4	7.0	1	3.0	-	-	4	12.2
e) No answer	1	1.8	-	-	1	2.9	-	-
Career Goal:								
a) Retain current position	17	29.8	8	23.5	8	22.9	11	33.3
b) Change fields	3	5.3	2	5.9	1	2.9	1	3.0
c) Advance within education	20	35.1	14	41.2	16	45.7	17	51.6
d) Other	5	8.8	2	5.9	3	8.6	-	-
e) Retain current position and change fields	2	3.5	1	2.9	1	2.9	-	-
f) Retain current position and and advance	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.0
g) Change fields and advance within education	4	7.0	4	11.8	1	2.9	1	3.0
h) Retain current position, change fields and advance within education	-	-	1	2.9	-	-	-	-
i) No answer	6	10.5	2	5.9	5	14.1	2	6.1
Years as an educator:								
a) 0- 5	10	17.5	9	26.5	8	22.9	1	3.0
b) 6-10	14	24.6	9	26.5	7	20.0	7	21.2
c) 11-15	10	17.5	5	14.7	10	28.6	6	18.2
d) 16 +	22	38.6	8	23.5	9	25.7	17	51.5
e) No answer	1	1.8	3	8.8	1	2.8	2	6.1
Satisfaction with Occupation:								
a) Very high	14	24.6	11	32.4	10	28.6	10	30.3
b) High	31	54.4	15	44.1	21	60.0	18	54.6
c) Average	10	17.5	8	23.5	4	11.4	4	12.1
d) Low	2	3.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
e) Very low	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
f) No answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.0

* Those who responded to Member Characteristics Survey.

** Actual number of participants.

TABLE 9 (cont.)

	L.A.(90)** *(N = 50)		Sacramento(50)** *(N = 34)		Orange(41)** *(N = 35)		Fresno(50)** *(N = 33)	
College/University Courses Completed in Career Counseling:	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
a) 0	24	43.9	12	35.3	12	34.3	16	48.5
b) 1	8	14.0	4	11.8	3	8.6	4	12.1
c) 2	7	12.3	-	-	5	14.3	2	6.1
d) 3	3	5.3	1	2.9	4	11.4	1	3.0
e) 4 +	14	24.5	17	50.0	11	31.4	10	30.3

DISSEMINATION

Besides the workshops, we are disseminating the project's materials and results by submitting our instructional materials to the Career Education Instructional Resource Center in Missoula, Montana and to the ERIC Clearinghouse in Counseling. We are also submitting this report to the ERIC Clearinghouse in Counseling. Furthermore, both authors expect to present papers at national and professional educational meetings and to prepare research reports on parts of the project for professional journals. Of course, the authors and staff will also continue to use and refine most instructional activities in their work at UCLA and UCLA Extension.

In addition, every team which completed the workshops will receive a copy of this report in order to help them appreciate the significance of their participation and remind them of the desirability of following through on their commitment to career guidance.

Follow-up Activities

Both coprincipal investigators are looking forward to conferring with participating teams about their progress and problems in implementing programs deriving from the workshop in 1980-81. Lack of funds will prevent us from visiting sites outside of the Los Angeles area, but we will gladly provide advice and a sympathetic ear by telephone or letter. In Fresno, Professor I. Ace Griffiths has volunteered to make one follow-up visit to each team in fall, 1980.

In terms of follow-through research with project data, we hope to look at the relation of various self-reported individual team member data to the success which the team achieves, and we plan to examine the correlates of the Career Growth Index in order to further test its construct validity and expand our knowledge of adult career maturity.

Internal Evaluation

Both coprincipal investigators expected that the project would require ongoing, minor alterations as it progressed. From the outset we prepared to collect and analyze data about the project as it was underway to improve it. In other words, we planned ongoing formative evaluation. Likewise, we recognized our need to attend to summative evaluation in order to quage the impact of the project.

Several factors reduced efficiency in both our formative and summative evaluation effort. Personnel changes, unexpected demands on the first author from recruitment, university liaison, and staff supervision, inexperience of staff

in data collection from workshop participants, and late completion of some instructional materials led to loss of some data, especially in the early workshops. In addition, inability to locate in the literature, or to define before the start of instruction, a set of steps for task force coalescence as described under Planning Discrepancy above, foiled collection of all data pertinent to the growth of the task forces of the workshop. Finally, initial emphasis on individual presentations rather than on orchestrating a series of instructional activities lessened our capability of upgrading the workshop as a whole. This latter problem stemmed, in part, from using local presenters who would not repeat and with whom we could coordinate minimally and in part from the necessity of attempting to achieve novel goals through relatively untried presentations. Doubtless, a longer time span would have helped avert this, but it is a problem which is intrinsic to a workshop seeking innovation.

In spite of these limitations, we gathered extensive data to aid in evaluation, and we made several shifts in the workshop over the six months of actual instruction. These shifts enabled us to achieve a modicum of success. Following is a narrative of our formative evaluation efforts, the shifts we made, and then practical recommendations based upon the experience.

Activities and Corrections

The initial participant responses to the Los Angeles workshop surprised all staff and led to substantial changes in the workshop focus. Both their expectations and variations in sophistication were unexpected and required attention. Especially, problematic however, were the differences in staff and participant expectations.

Our proposal had aimed to help schools establish career guidance programs built around teachers providing individual or small group career advising in coordination with counselors. This followed a model at Huntington Beach's Ocean Park High School and the Student Services Program in Brooklyn College in which the first author had served. Contacts with selected schools and the Advisory Committee suggested that it was a feasible model. We assumed that career centers and infusion activities were already in operation and that a major obstacle to improvement of career guidance programs was lack of a mechanism to stimulate the individual student to seek out continued, planned career development activities and to periodically reflect upon their significance with a mature, career-wise adult.

Our first and subsequent workshops indicated that most participants were instead interested in the more modest goals of establishing or expanding career centers or career development infusion activities. Only a few looked forward to developing a system of teacher or student career advisers. Clearly the modest goals were realistic in view of the "wait and see" climate of 1979-80.

Our judgments about the goals and needs of the workshop participants derived from staff observations obtained as they participated in task force team meetings and from task force leader introductory statements about their schools' programs and workshop goals. In addition to alerting us to the interest in infusion, these data and partial data from the participant characteristic forms and presentation evaluations indicated that the participants differed greatly in their knowledge of, and involvement in, career education. As the participant characteristic section indicated, a third to a half had no formal courses in career guidance, while as many had four or more courses. Many participants, too, weren't clear about their goals and were not well acquainted with teammates. Some participants even decided that their team composition was insufficient to realistically try to create a school program, and other task forces found some of their members unmotivated for a task force effort.

In late November, we agreed to deemphasize instruction in an individualized career guidance effort and turned our attention to programs based upon coordinated lessons for infusing career development. Even during fall, 1979, Los Angeles workshops, we were able to assemble and distribute a set of exemplary career development infusion lessons. For the spring workshops, optional presentations on career education infusion and exemplary high school programs formed around infusion were upgraded to central presentations.

To open communication between task force teams so that they could share ideas about infusion and career centers and to enable us to learn about participant desires, additional alterations were made in the Los Angeles workshop format. Presentation times were reduced to allow participants to deliberate with colleagues about a session's meaning and to share their reactions with the workshop staff. We scheduled a formal opportunity for multiteam, public trouble shooting with three eminent California career educators. Moreover, presenters encouraged participants to work with educators from other schools on some of the exercises and to get to know one another over coffee and lunch.

In addition, we contacted team leaders telephonically to discuss their reactions and goals between sessions. We also polled participants about issues to include in forthcoming presentations on December 8th. This latter poll, however, drew less than 10% response.

For the spring workshops, we had regionally eminent career educators join our staff for continued trouble shooting during the workshop days; and in Sacramento we contracted with Dr. Weissman for additional consultation with teams at their site.

Regretfully at the project's outset we did not have the set of steps for becoming a team which we delineated under discrepancies. Lack of defined steps prevented us from attending to team development as we would have liked. Without that feedback we did not entertain alterations in our operation such as meeting with teams at their sites before and during the workshop or describing teams progress and having teams monitor their own progress with a single ongoing consultant over the workshop, which we would now recommend. Certainly, early awareness of these steps would have primed all staff to give more attention to team development than they did. It, likewise, would have suggested specific corrective actions for consultants to take.

The Los Angeles attendance data, too, suggested program changes. Saturday attendance dropped approximately 25% from Friday attendance; some participants returned late from lunch or not at all; and others left between 2:00 to 3:00 in order to make after school commitments, well before our scheduled conclusion at 4:00 p.m. Of course, many participants legitimately had to be at other places, especially afternoon and Saturday jobs or family responsibilities. To alleviate the problem, we altered the original 9:00-12:00 and 1:00-4:00 schedule to 9:00-1:00 and 2:00-4:00 schedule. This enabled the person who had to leave early to attend at least two complete sessions. Likewise, we started to examine the willingness of spring participants to come on Saturdays. Follow ups of schools declining to participate were also indicating the difficulty which Saturday attendance created.

Next, the analysis of our December recruiting for the spring workshops, which had been delayed by the departure of the original coordinator, indicated that no Orange County schools would send a team to Saturday's workshops and that schools in both the Orange and Fresno area could not envision so long a workshop. Indeed, many feared that they would be unable to participate unless they received compensation for substitutes. Until a couple of days before the

Sacramento workshop, Dr. Weissman's information indicated that 15-18 teams, totaling 80 participants would attend the projected six-seven day program. However, approximately half that number appeared, owing no doubt to over optimism by some team leaders.

In view of these responses to recruiting, we sought and obtained approval in January to reduce the workshops to four days (keep six in Sacramento) and to use the savings to compensate teams for a maximum of three substitutes per workshop day at maximum of $40. Only this plus the extra efforts of Mr. Howard Atamian and Dr. I. Ace Griffiths in Fresno, allowed assembling enough participating teams. By December and January fears about Proposition 9 were rampant and were hardening the "wait and see" attitude.

The spring workshops brought new challenges. First each regional workshop had its own character, especially since different kinds of teams attended each. The Orange County workshop contained teams from two CETA sponsored programs housed in Saddleback and Orange Coast Community Colleges, a veteran team planning a career guidance staff inservice for the Anaheim district, and teams from several high schools. Their program objectives were different and their career education experience and team compositions differed remarkably. In Fresno, about half the participants were from the Fresno Unified District and half from the suburban and rural communities near Fresno. Several of the Fresno City Schools were 9th grade only schools, a new innovation, and properly sought out and appreciated opportunities to interface with the Fresno senior high schools. The Sacramento workshop, in turn, drew a Sacramento State University team of representatives of counseling units for special populations who sought to articulate better among themselves, two CETA based programs, three community college teams, and high school teams.

The second challenge stemmed from reduced time duration. The shortening of the workshop almost put out of reach our goals of a thought-out, interdisciplinary guidance program. It also reduced the corrections which could be made. Nevertheless, adjustments were made in the Sacramento and Orange workshops. In the initial morning session in Sacramento, for example, the college, community college and CETA teams became frustrated about the appropriateness of the workshop for them after brief team meetings and trying to share their goals and problems with one another under the facilitation of Drs. Weissman and Markert. Not fully aware of their frustration, Dr. Healy followed the workshop schedule by delivering the lecture-discussion on program evaluation.

Pursuit of this topic, which our observations suggest will only be regarded as pertinent after considerable attitude change, led many participants to feel that their needs were being ignored. Furtunately, the staff detected that insufficient opportunity to develop concerns was creating the problem. Consequently the next morning's presentation was reorganized to highlight how problem solving concepts applied to team concerns, and provision was made for interteam discussion of particular concerns. The revised problem solving presentation which entailed starting problem solving with the Elkhorn School case and shortening the review of concept definitions, and the following excellent presentation on infusion by Ms. Pequeño persuaded the participants who returned the second day that the workshop would serve them. Unfortunately, three teams withdrew after the first day, apparently because of differences of expectations.

Also as a consequence of observing this first day's difficulties, Dr. Stan Green volunteered to introduce subsequent workshops in a way that would elicit each team's goals and enable him as an independent observer to point out how the workshop would contribute to that goal. Discussion with participants suggested that many of the participants were surprised by the workshop's emphasis on planning instead of methods and weren't able to move as quickly into program planning as intended. After they had considered the appropriateness of planning, as happened in the Fresno and Los Angeles workshops, they were receptive to task force planning. Clearly, however, the participants weren't going to be hurried into planning by a university group.

This confusion, of course, underscored lack of communication between workshop organizers and participants, and it suggested the need of meeting with each team at their school/college before the workshop in order to clarify expectations and obligations. Although a letter and recruiting brochure had gone to every school/college in the Sacramento area, and although Dr. Healy had reemphasized the task force planning focus in an orientation to representatives of the Sacramento groups nine days previously, many participants were ignorant of the recruiting materials and orientation. In addition, more than a few were not even sure about why they had been sent.

If one considers the steps in team coalescence, the reaction of the Sacramento participants probably also manifests the fact that most of the teams were at step one of becoming teams. Had this been clearer at the time, we would have made more radical alterations in the remainder of the workshop to

foster team building. These would have included individual team meetings on site in lieu of the planned program.

A somewhat different problem arose in Orange, owing in part to confusion caused by the delayed start, which was caused by rain. There teams had minimal time for task force interaction during the first two days, and project staff omitted retrieving the progress planning forms. Since these forms reinforced the planning focus, and were important for increasing the helpfulness of the staff in task force planning during the final two sessions, a task force group planning session replaced a full self-awareness session. The inserted session reviewed the elements of a career guidance program and pointed out the questions in the planning progress sheet about which teams would be expected to comment publically on the following afternoon.

Several teams used the planning time well. They impressed Drs. Swan, Healy and Ms. Yen by the productivity and their questions. Although Dr. Markert found that the time was frustrating to two teams, those teams weren't as aware as other teams that program planning was the unifying element of the workshop. Yet their frustration may have been helpful, for by Friday afternoon at least one of these groups was deciding how to launch a modest task force planning effort subsequent to the workshop.

Not to be ignored in this review of formative evaluation activities were revisions by staff in individual instruction units based upon feedback. Dr. Sorenson, for example, created more, simpler definitions of concepts for his materials and presentations, covered fewer points in his presentations, explained concepts more thoroughly and gave more examples, furnished more illustrations of applications, encouraged more questioning by participants, and redirected participant questions to one another to stimulate their sharing of applications from their own experience.

Comment

Our formative evaluation efforts left several practical considerations which those extolling formative evaluation or attempting to apply it should consider. Most explications of formative evaluation have not elaborated upon such considerations.

First, evaluating a multiobjective, multiunit program formatively requires extensive planning, careful instrument selection or development, equally careful observer training, ongoing coordination and communication, willingness to subordinate individual accomplishment to program accomplishment, and flexibility. Program participants must plan together so that they understand the interrelation of parts and the program goal, and there must be constant vigilance

that each instructional unit supports the overall program goal and that no unit consumes excessive presentation time or staff energy and attention. To accomplish these tasks a staff has to have evolved clear roles vis a vis each other and become a smoothly functioning team. This accomplishment plus the full comprehension of the program to be delivered and evaluated takes substantial time, probably proportionate to the number of persons on the staff.

Second, proper articulation requires the program leadership to have a concrete picture of different instructional units and their relation to the goal and to communicate to other staff whether the picture is emerging or fixed. When the former, the leadership should be sure that staff are informed about changes in program units and interrelationships. In turn, staff must not change units without informing the leadership. This kind of component conceptualization and coordinated operationalization again requires clear, ongoing communication and time. Staff need to appreciate where each other is coming from with regard to the project.

Ideally, leaders and staff will identify a series of benchmarks which successful learners and teams can be expected to achieve on the way to realizing the total goal. Then they can make provision for gathering, processing, and analyzing observations of these benchmarks, and they can utilize the feedback to pace instruction. When the goal of the program is a new kind of achievement such as a functioning multidisciplinary career guidance task force, when the literature is not explicit about time and resource demands of approaches for creating such teams, and when there are disagreements about what the benchmarks of task group formation are, the program staff pursuing such a goal, especially in a formative way, should anticipate dealing with ambiguity and needing to make adjustments as they proceed. The anticipation should arm them against the anxiety which such an effort typically would bring.

Third, formative evaluation alarms or falsifies if it depends too heavily upon impressions of the instant and immediate outcomes. If the observer does not take readings of immediate reactions from an informed perspective, he or she may easily provide inncomplete reports about what is transpiring and this can lead the evaluator to draw erroneous conclusions. This is because feedback about learning can only be interpreted correctly by placing it in context; that is, immediate feedback must be assessed against what one would expect in such situations. The observer's and evaluator's background and understanding of the program should, for example, alert him or her to expect both resistance

to new ideas about how to operate in one's job and confusion about how to perform the new roles. In general, before evaluating particular instruction, the observer and evaluator should study the learning curves associated with the instructional modes comprising a program. Otherwise, he or she risks being overwhelmed by a single case experience. Certainly, experience with the instructional modes and the audiences can also safeguard one from naive, incomplete observation and subsequence misjudgment.

Fourth, formative evaluation can efficiently improve only those programs built upon clear rationales which take into account the experience of similar projects. Designers must delineate why the parts and their combination should produce the intended outcomes. If they project departures from common sense, they must justify them. This delineation is necessary not only to insure that the program is as likely to work as possible before launching it, an especially important caution when working with people, but also to insure that evaluators pinpoint the kinds of data to be gathered about its operation.

Moreover, only by examining pertinent research and similar projects can the program designers and evaluators efficiently improve the program. Without such review the designers may be ignorant of particular instructional devices or how instructional strategies are likely to mesh when used with the kind of audience they are serving. Even though an approach may have proved itself in other programs and be appealing because of learner benefits beyond the program, one automatically cannot delay program goal realizations until one can refine the instruction. Instead, one may have to substitute a totally different element if it meshes better, even if it hasn't as potentially many side benefits. Without reviewing how others have sought similar programs goals, one will not be aware of alternates for a program element. Especially in a complex program of multiple elements like ours, it is essential that the leaders seek out the range of alternative operations and teach the observers to acquire evidence about the existing and alternate strategies. This is the case because in a multiunit program the purpose is not to improve one element as much as possible but rather to put in place the element that will best interface with other components. Truly the whole must be more than its parts.

Fifth, closely linked to a preliminary, informed, thorough specification of the rationale are utilization of observers who have extensive experience with different instructional methods and different ways of organizing them. Otherwise, the observer is unlikely to notice cues for alternative instructional strategies and organization which are suggested by the operation of the program.

After all, formative evaluation is the process of correcting, which sometimes means altering drastically, instruction on the basis of observing how the tentative program operates. Observations and recommendations by the experienced career educators, Drs. Stan Green, and Bob Swan, alerted us to several corrections. Writers on formative evaluation have all but ignored the fact that wide ranging observation of instructional actions is a prerequisite to formative evaluation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The project helped about 70% of the participating teams to advance in establishing interdisciplinary career guidance programs, and it acquainted individual participants with a problem solving approach and concepts that provide a basis for offering professional, accountable career guidance practice. More time and more awareness of the required participant commitment expected would have enhanced the project's accomplishments even more. Following are our recommendations for expanded staff development projects. When we secure another staff development program, we shall follow the instructional materials and lessons developed for this project. We invite other staff developers to refine and adapt our materials, and would be happy to confer about refinement. The materials are being submitted to the ERIC Counseling Clearinghouse under the title, Staff Development Materials, for Career Counseling Task Forces, and of course, each participating team in this project has a copy of them.

The thirteen-month experience suggested several improvements for projects trying to create interdisciplinary education teams for career guidance. We have organized them under the following recommendations:

1. Triple the duration of the project so that there is enough time to pre-test instructional packages and to create field support. In the first six months have the project director coordinate selected designers of exemplary, career guidance programs, university faculty, and school district and college curriculum directors in devising a short needs assessment and in developing workshop instructional units. Each unit should include required reading and homework assignments and should be able to be evaluated as a unit as well as in terms of its contribution to team development and individual learner technical competence. At the same time the project director will supervise a program evaluator in organizing these experts to create evaluation instruments. In addition, the evaluator would develop an instructional unit for teaching teams to monitor their progress as teams and individuals over the workshop, and he or she will devise rating schedules for assessing team development and train raters in their use.

   In the second six months pilot test the workshop. Ideally, an experienced staff development expert in career education such as Dr. Stan Green or Bob Swan will observe the pilot test. Then that

observer, the director, the expert presenters and staff evaluator will analyze the feedback during and after the pilot testing to make improvements.

Concomitantly, during the first year the project administrative assistant should identify colleges and schools interested in an inter-disciplinary guidance program, arrange regional orientations by the director to describe the proposed service, and establish contracts for enrollment in the first year pilot program and for the second year's instructional program.

If the pilot workshop is not judged promsing after refinements, the project should be discontinued. Likewise, only regions with enough enrollment should be included in the second year.

In year two deliver the refined instruction program. Have the project coordinator aided by the staff evaluator and the team leaders monitor team coalescence and team member growth over the program. Facilitate the team leader using consultation or catch-up instruction to remedy difficulties which appear and reorganize instructional elements should team growth not be proceeding as expected.

In the third year, coordinated, follow-up consulting services should be provided, and this might be augmented by special instruction which the second year's experience suggested as necessary.

2. Create a flexible instructional package, allowing operations such as site visitations, vouchers for so many consulting hours with mutually agreed upon consultants, large workshop meetings, homeworks, optional catch-up meetings, and readings.
3. In the first six months of the project review literature in organization development and confer with experts in order to refine and more fully describe the steps which this project suggested are benchmarks in becoming a task force. Test the refined steps by evaluating teams on them during the pilot and use them for monitoring team progress and suggesting corrections in team development during the second year of the project.
4. Visit each team before they are accepted into the program to insure that they and their principal administrator know the purpose of the program and the expectations of participants. Have the administrator contract for the service. Include stipulation that released time

be provided for teamwork. Have each team member in turn contract to complete assignments and attend 80% or more the instruction. Only enroll teams who will accept equal responsibility with the program director for achieving the project goals.

Insist that each team have a designated leader. Recommend appointment of a person who has administrative and faculty support, is able to plan and implement programs and will commit time and energy to coordinate career guidance program. Further advise the administrator that the remaining team members should be interested in helping students in their career development, believe that the team will be supported and that they will have freedom to try out new ideas and practices, and are willing to work cooperatively with other educators and community people.

5. Have the consultants and the team leaders complete our short needs assessment survey of their teams in order to verify their need for all program elements, especially the optional lessons and readings. Amend contracts if the needs assessment indicates such.
6. In concert with a site coordinator, create a regional network of the team leaders and arrange that they meet periodically in the second and third year for trouble shooting and to share accomplishments. Also contract with the site coordinators for organizing workshop arrangements, overseeing the network, and consulting as appropriate. Contract with experts to develop, revise and deliver lessons or train a substitute to deliver them over the three years. In addition, contract with a small number of consultants, some of whom may be lesson developers, advisory committee members, or advanced doctoral students, to provide consulting to team and to maintain liaison on a voucher basis over a two-year period. For assistance in observation and workshop arrangements, hire and train temporaries. Assist both regional and team leaders in building teams through consultation and seek their advice about alterations in the workshop.
7. Secure full-time personnel who expect to serve for three years for the positions of administrative consultant, project evaluator, and secretary.
8. Hold all large workshop meetings within the region in a school, college or donated facility, with accessible, inexpensive parking and eating facilities.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

(Date)

Personally address High School Principal
and Community College President

Make one copy for Career Counselor in the High School

We would like to offer you the opportunity of sending a team of four to eight professionals to one of the five tuition-free comprehensive career counseling workshops UCLA is conducting for California high schools and community college in 1979-80.

The major purpose of the workshop is to turn teams of teachers, counselors, administrators, and community leaders into task forces that can offer quality career counseling with existing staff and resources. To prepare for this mission, workshop participants will examine and confer with experts about the latest ideas and practices in career development, including infusing career education and collaboration among school professionals and community. Concomitantly, participants will work with their teammates in formulating a career counseling plan for their school and in beginning implementation of it. Discussion and troubleshooting with our instructional staff and with colleagues from other schools will aid them in inaugurating a viable plan before the workshop ends.

To provide you with all the relevant information about the project, we invite you and your school's director or coordinator of career education and/or counseling to an orientation meeting, scheduled for Wednesday, December 6, in the morning from 10:00-noon, and again in the afternoon from 1:00-3:00.

The orientation sessions will be held in the Instructional Media Center, Room C-1, of the Fresno Unified School District. The building is located at 3132 E. Fairmont, one block east of Fashion Fair Shopping Center, in Fresno.

We are pleased that our project's site coordinator in Fresno and the surrounding counties will be Howard Atamian, Career Education Coordinator for the Fresno Unified School District. Howard can be reached at (209) 441-3119.

The workshop consists of eight training days, conducted over a four-month period, and intends to help teams of teachers, counselors, administrators, and county leaders become "task forces" that can develop and implement programs of quality career counseling with existing staff and resources.

The Fresno workshop for 12 area high school and community college teams is scheduled tentatively for February 22-23, March 21-22, April 25-26, and May 23-24..

Our program will emphasize local expertise and a team planning orientation which is, above all, sensitive to conditions and constraints in the local high school or community college. We expect local businesses and career development programs to play a part. In sum, we intend to reach out in several directions to put together a different kind of training experience, and we hope you will take this opportunity to hear more about it.

If you have any questions, please call Howard Atamian in Fresno or our UCLA offices at (213) 825-3000.

Cordially,

Charles Healy, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and
Project Director

James Quinn, Ph.D.
Project Coordinator

CH:JQ:il

cc: Howard Atamian
Career Counselor

CAREER COUNSELING TASK FORCE PROJECT 1979
Garth Sorenson, UCLA

INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING CASE SUMMARIES

Counseling requires a good deal of problem solving and decision making on the part of both counselor and counselee. Sound decision making requires the gathering and analyzing of accurate information and the application of valid decision rules to that information. One of the most difficult problems in counseling is how to obtain accurate information about counselees and their predicaments, and about potentially useful interventions.

In any counseling interview the counselor inevitably acquires a great deal of information, most of which must be discarded because it is not relevant to the problem(s) at hand. Obviously the client is not entirely clear about what is relevant or he/she would not need counseling. Indeed one of the things professional training should teach the counselor is a set of guidelines that will enable him/her to determine the nature of a counselee's problems, what decisions have to be made and when, what information is needed in order soundly to make those decisions, and what information can be ignored.

The exercises which make use of case summaries are partly exercises in sorting and classifying information according to a set of rules--determining what is relevant and what is not. The rules to be employed are determined by one's views about the role of the counselor and the dynamics of human behavior. The rules in these exercises are intended to be consistent with the cognitive conceptual framework that is described in the attached paper by Sorenson. A Rogerian counselor, or Freudian or Gestalt therapist, for example, would employ a different set of rules.

It should be remembered that because the counselor is continually receiving new information about clients, psychological diagnosis is an ongoing process and any set of hunches about the causes of a person's difficulties is likely to need revision as the information becomes more complete.

The task in these exercises therefore is not to determine "what is really going on" with the persons described, but to indicate what inferences are warranted from the information presented in the case summaries.

CASE SUMMARY: JOE TAYLOR

George Sylvester had barely sat down at his desk in the Counseling Office at Central Valley College where he worked as a part-time consultant when Joe Taylor walked in. "Professor Newby said I had to see you personally," said Joe.

George had known Professor Newby a long time. "Why me in particular?" he asked Joe.

"I want to repeat Calculus II," said Joe, "and he said he wouldn't let me take the class again without your recommendation."

"How many times have you failed Calculus II?" asked George.

"Three," said Joe.

"And you want to try it again. Why do you need Calculus II?" asked George.

"You have to have it to get a degree in engineering. I want to be an engineer."

"I guess before I could recommend calculus again I'd need to go over your academic record with you, have you complete some of our occupational interest inventories, and review your career plans generally. It might take us as long as a couple of days."

"Why can't you just give me the recommendation?" asked Joe. "There is a track meet on and I want to attend some of the events. Besides, there is this girl . . ." His voice trailed off.

"I'll be back in this office a week from today. Would you like to see me then?" asked George.

"Classes start on Monday. Why can't you just give me the recommendation? After all, if I fail again it is no skin off your elbow. It's my time that's involved." Joe sounded belligerent.

George's manner was mild, soft spoken. "It's also the school's resources, Professor Newby's time, and my reputation," he said.

"I thought you shrinks, or counselors, or whatever you call yourselves were supposed to help people do what they want to do," said Joe.

George ignored the remark, picked up the telephone, and dialed the Counseling Center's psychometrist. "If Joe Taylor comes to see you, please have him do the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Kuder Perference Record, and the Terman Concepts Mastery Test. And could you please have someone get an up-to-date copy of his college transcript, and a copy of his high school record, and his admission test scores, and send them all to me."

Part II

Late in the afternoon of that day, after Joe's tests had been scored, George Sylvester spent approximately two hours with him, discussing his high school and college records, his scores on the admission tests and interest inventories, and their implications for his career. He also spoke briefly about job trends and employment possibilities. Joe in turn complained a lot about the bureaucracy of the school, the terrible repressive society in which we live--a society which young people did not make--and the materialism and hypocrisy of the older generation. At one point George had asked, "Why do you want to be an engineer?"

"Well, my father was an engineer, I've just always wanted to be an engineer."

Towards the end of the two hours George had said, "Let me summarize the things we've talked about, and see if you agree with me. First of all, you've always been a good student, but you've done much better in some subjects than in others. You've always made 'A's' in English, history, and foreign languages, for example, and without much effort."

"That's right," said Joe.

"You say you want to be an engineer, and to become an engineer requires that you pass courses in calculus."

"Yes," said Joe.

"And you've always had trouble in math. In both high school and college you've had to repeat math courses."

"Well I didn't like them so I didn't put in enough time on them," said Joe.

"You're gregarious, and self confident around people. You like to perform in school plays, and enjoy participating in class discussions. You have friends."

"Yea," said Joe, "I guess that's about right."

"Although you say you didn't work hard enough in your math courses, you probably worked harder than most of the other students."

Joe did not reply.

"You've probably worked harder and more systematically than most of your classmates in school, but you haven't had any job experience. You haven't had any jobs for which you've received pay."

"Just for cutting my dad's lawn, and other chores. My father said he didn't want me to have to work the way he did when he was a kid."

"You don't see that your school experience which you have enjoyed--except for the math--has any particular relevance to your future occupation," said George. "You were editor of your school paper, and you're a reporter on the college paper, but you don't see those experiences as important in your career planning."

"I love writing," said Joe. "But you are right. You can't make a living doing it. It doesn't pay well enough."

"You don't know very much about what engineers do."

"Well I know they do a lot of different things. There are mechanical engineers, and civil engineers, and electrical engineers, etc. But you're right. My father never got around to telling me what he does, and I never got around to asking him."

"Your interest inventories tell us that you do not like to do the kinds of things that engineers in general like to do," said George. "You don't have the same reading habits, or hobbies, for example."

"Well, work is something you get paid for," said Joe. "You're not supposed to like it."

"But you do have interests similar to those of people who work in occupations requiring high verbal skills--law, journalism, English teaching."

"Look, my father wants me to be an engineer," said Joe, "and he'd say that since he is paying my way he ought to have something to say about what I study. Besides, he's always counted on me following in his footsteps."

"I don't think that you have acquired enough information or done enough thinking to make a decision this afternoon. And I do think that you should consider some alternatives other than engineering. There are a number of ways the Counseling Office can help you that we haven't talked about yet, if you'd want to spend a little more time--not today of course. Would you be willing to come see me again?"

"I'll think about it," said Joe.

"Do you understand why I think you should consider alternatives?"

"Sure," said Joe. "There is my academic record, and my interest inventories, and the aptitude tests we talked about, and my experience on the school newspapers. And if I were not to major in engineering I'd have at least an extra year to explore alternative possibilities before I had to make up my mind." He grinned and acted friendly for the first time. "You even think I could be a college professor if I wanted to be."

"That's right," said George. "Any other questions today?"

"Just one," said Joe, "do I get a recommendation to get back into Calculus II or don't I?"

Name_____ School_____ Date_____ Time req_____

EXERCISE: JOE TAYLOR

Following are a number of statements (inferences) about Joe Taylor, his problems, the kind of help he needs, and the information required to evaluate a counseling procedure. Please read each statement and indicate by encircling the appropriate number on the scale to the right of the item whether or not that statement is supported by information contained in the case summary.

1. strongly disagree, there is counter-information
2. disagree, there is no supporting information
3. undecided, cannot say
4. agree, there is at least one item of supporting information
5. strongly agree, there are several items of supporting information

A. Signs that Joe Taylor has a problem, or is likely to have a serious problem in the foreseeable future.

1.	He has failed a very important course.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	He is bored with school.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	He shows signs of considerable psychological distress.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	He is committed to a plan that promises to cause unhappiness in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	He is lonely, unable to make and keep friends.	1	2	3	4	5

B. Causes of Joe's problems.

6.	He is very impulsive, lacks time management and self-management skills.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	His communication skills are weak.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	He lacks essential skills that he needs to do what he wants to do.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	His chosen vocational goal appears to be inconsistent with his interests and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	He appears to be overly concerned about pleasing his father.	1	2	3	4	5

C. Counseling interventions. Joe's counselors or teachers should

11.	Help Joe to learn more about the engineering profession, and why math is required in engineering schools.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Encourage him and his father to reconsider his plan to become an engineer.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Encourage him to work harder in mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Encourage Joe to give up the idea of becoming an engineer.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Help Joe examine career opportunities in occupations relating to the subjects he likes best, and in which he is most successful.	1	2	3	4	5

D. Evaluation. Which items of information, if obtained six weeks after Joe's initial interview with the counselor, would suggest that counseling had been successful?

16.	Joe had dropped out of school.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Joe had obtained permission to enroll in Calculus II, and was spending 5 hours a day studying calculus.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Joe had discussed his problems with his father, and they had agreed that Joe should consider another major.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Joe had interviewed several teachers, lawyers, engineers, and reporters about their jobs, and what they had to do to be successful in their work.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Joe had begun psychoanalysis.	1	2	3	4	5

Interest Level

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
dull			so-so			interesting

Difficulty level

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
too easy			about right			too hard

ON PROBLEMS AND PROBLEM SOLVING

Garth Sorenson, UCLA Career Counseling Workshop

I. Assumptions

A. The counselor's major functions include helping people

1. to solve problems of living (see below)

2. to develop their positive potentialities

3. to reduce psychological discomfort and increase sense of well being

B. Counselors do their job by applying knowledge gained from personal experience as counselors, from applied ethics (moral philosophy) and from psychology and related disciplines.

C. Counselors must be accountable. We must use methods that can be objectively evaluated; and we must devote a part of our professional effort to evaluating and improving those procedures.

II. Definitions

A. Event. A happening, occurrence

1. Public (external) events are those that are potentially observable by two or more individuals. Jogging, pounding a nail, the flash of lightning, the sound of thunder are examples of public events.

2. Private (internal) events are those that are potentially observable by only one person. Dreams, toothaches, feelings of guilt, vocational interests are examples of private events.

B. Concept. A set of decision (inclusion) rules that define a class category) of events, objects, or relationships. The rules may be in an individual's head (see rule below) stated orally, or written down.

C. Principle. A statement of the relationship(s) between two or more concepts, e.g., "men like women," "punishment sometimes inhibits unwanted behavior," "young people usually have to try out several occupations before finding one they like."

D. Know.

1. To be informed about, familiar with, aware of, e.g., "I know that one needs less than a high school education to perform 80% of the jobs in this country."

2. To be able to do; to have a skill as a result of experience, e.g., "John knows (how to speak) Spanish, and (how to play) the violin."

E. Understand. To perceive the meaning of, grasp what is meant. A person may be said to understand a concept when he/she can

1. correctly paraphrase the defintiion, i.e., define the concept in his/her own words.

2. cite correct instances of the concept not given by the teacher or textbook.

3. recognize whether or not a particular instance is an example of a concept.

4. apply the concept in solving a problem (see III-D).

F. Infer. To arrive at a decision or opinion by reasoning from observations or information. "I infer that John Doe is not interested in this workshop from my observation that he attends only part time and is frequently late to the sessions he does attend."

G. Problem. A problem occurs when a person wants to do something and doesn't know how to do it. Both of two conditions, (a) motivation, and (b) ignorance, must be present for there to be a problem.

H. Problems of living. Unpleasant and recurring difficulties that sometimes arise as individuals strive to achieve physical and material well being, satisfying relations with other people, personal fulfillment, etc. Problems of living with which counselors are commonly concerned have to do with career planning, personal conflicts, difficulties in child rearing, etc.

I. Cause. A situation, or event, or agent that produces an effect or result. A condition that when present allows an event to occur. If for example children must be attentive in order to learn what their teachers want them to learn (principle), then inattention can be a cause of failure to learn.

If it is a condition that a person must have a high school diploma to get a particular kind of job (although not necessarily to perform it), then lack of a diploma may be said to be a cause of unemployment. (Note: that is not to suggest that lack of a high school diploma is a major cause.)

J. Rule.

1. An inferred mental process that enables a person to cope with a category of events or relationships, e.g., noticing, categorizing, perceiving relationships, inferring causes, making plans.

2. A sentence that represents such a mental process. Example: Recently I overheard a teen-ager tell her friend how she had coped with a potentially embarrassing event. "The men were whistling and making remarks, but I just kept walking and didn't say nothin." I infer that her rule might be stated, "To avoid being accosted, look straight ahead, say nothing, and keep walking." (See also III-D-2.).

K. Maxim. A general principle drawn from practical experience and serving as a rule of conduct. The illustration in J-2 represents a maxim, a rule, and a heuristic rule (see III-D-2).

III. Some propositions about problems and problem solving.

A. Problems exist within persons--not outside persons. A situation that is a problem for one person may not be for another. When we talk about "the

problem" we actually mean a particular person's problem, e.g., the counselor's problem, or Jane Doe's problem. Sometimes it is useful to ask, "Who has the problem?".

B. A problem disappears when (1) the motivation which was part of the problem changes; (2) the ignorance is remedied, i.e., the individual learns how to do something he/she could not do before; or (3) the situation changes so that the obstacle is removed. For example, if the woman who had written a Dear John letter changed her mind and told John that she wanted to marry him after all, the problem evoked by his receipt of the letter would have disappeared. (That is not to say he might not have a new set of problems.)

C. People fail to solve problems when they (1) are unable to give up unrealizable goals; (2) lack needed information; (3) are misinformed about matters important to the solution of the problem; (4) have counterproductive habits--habits that make the problem worse rather than better; or (5) experience strong emotions, such as anger, fear, or love which interfere with their thinking.

D. Problem solving requires the application of a rule (or principle, or maxim). We commonly use two kinds of rules in problem solving:

1. Algorithmic rules are those that will always give a solution, provided that they can be applied to the problem at hand. These are usually arithmetic rules.

2. Heuristic rules are those that will sometimes give a solution to the problem. Even though a given heuristic rule doesn't always work, knowledge of the rule optimizes our chances of solving any of the class of problems to which it applies. These are usually rules of thumb, based on experience. For example, the rules of grammar are heuristic rules that enable us to communicate more effectively. Social conventions are rules that enable us to live together more easily. Most counseling problems require the application of heuristic rules.

E. Counselors help individuals to solve problems of living by taking actions or asking questions that will

1. reduce strong emotions that interfere with the individual's thought processes,

2. clarify values and goals,

3. reveal obstacles to problem solving, e.g., misinformation, conflicts in goals or values, gaps in knowledge, etc.,

4. teach concepts and rules in such a way that a person can apply them.

F. Counselors teach by

1. providing models--setting examples for their counselees to imitate,

2. explaining concepts and principles,

3. providing exercises, homework, etc., which require that the counselee practice applying what is being taught,

4. giving feedback.

H. Counselors help groups of people solve problems by applying the same techniques they use with individuals. In addition, they sometimes find it useful to

1. help to organize (structure) the group for action, e.g., assign tasks to individuals, or get them to assign themselves tasks,

2. facilitate communication by paraphrasing a person's comments,

3. point out conflicts in values or goals which exist between group members,

4. encourage group members who are in conflict over goals or procedures to find alternatives which are mutually satisfying,

5. encourage compromise when 4 (immediately above) fails.

IV. Outline of a counseling strategy

A. Remind yourself that you are to observe yourself and your actions as well as those of your counselee(s), trying to notice the effects of your actions on the person(s) with whom you are working, making note of what works, so that you can try it again and of what doesn't work so that you can change it.

B. Get acquainted with the counselee or group before you try any counseling intervention. Make the counselee(s) feel comfortable in your presence. Begin to take the steps that will establish your credibility.

C. Ask about (his, her, their) dissatisfactions--the things they want to change, and their priorities. Paraphrase their answers to more fully clarify their wants and goals, and to make certain you have understood what they have tried to tell you. Control your own actions so that the relationship will be a cooperative one but with responsibility for goals with the person(s) you are trying to help.

D. Continuing that cooperative effort, help them to define the obstacles that stand in the way of achieving their goals. Observe carefully to pick up clues as to patterns of negative feelings and counterproductive actions, and the events and situations (causes) that appear to trigger those feelings and actions. Share your perceptions and ideas with them.

E. Try to figure out concepts and principles which if properly applied would enable them to deal with the causes of their difficulties--the obstacles to problem solving. Try to teach them those principles. Try to get them to make their own applications. When you encounter beliefs that are in opposition to those you are trying to teach, try to avoid directly confronting those beliefs--unless they seem inconsistent with the rest of the individual's belief system. Try to get the individual to take constructive action instead of arguing about beliefs, and about who is right.

F. Check periodically to see if (1) the concepts and principles that you have been trying to teach have been learned; (2) applications have been made, i.e., actions consistent with the principles have been taken; (3) goals have been achieved; and (4) psychological distress has been reduced and sense of well being increased.

APPENDIX C

INITIATING TEACHER USE OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES IN CAREER EDUCATION AND GUIDANCE

Purpose

The object of this exercise is to initiate teachers hereafter called cadre in interacting with business and community resource providers.

Rationale

The involvement of the community in career education is recognized by most planners as essential. Many work experiences and most work models will not be available to students unless they are provided by sectors of the community outside of the school. Yet there is now little community involvement in the formal school program. In part this is because educators lack familiarity with what their communities expect to do in career education, and in part it is because the community is similarly unfamiliar with school needs and constraints. Consequently, educators and community representatives need to come together to discuss how they can collaborate in career education. This module will demonstrate a method of initiating an educator-community representative dialogue on collaboration in career education.

Preparation

Assemble a panel of five or six representatives from business and from agencies which can provide services in career education to your schools. Before the meeting inform the panelists in a letter that you expect them to present a short description of their company's or agency's involvement in career education and to give their own ideas, not binding upon their company or agency, about other possible career education activities. Such activities include: 3- to 4-day loans of employees to instruct students in schools, lease or loan of materials for school simulations, collaboration by an employee or a volunteer with a classroom teacher in planning and implementing a work simulation, paid or unpaid opportunities for teachers and students to shadow a worker in the performance of his job, paid summer employment for teachers, rotating teachers through different kinds of occupations, and financial underwriting of a person to coordinate school-community collaboration.

In the letter (Attachment 1), define "infusion of career education" for the panelists, noting that the keystone is integrating career education into existing curriculum. Point out that the activities upon which you are asking them to comment are ones which promote infusion. Point out that the community can work cooperatively (that is, assist educators

as educators request it), or they can collaborate (that is, share responsibility for planning, execution, and evaluation).

Advise the panelists that you want them to identify for the educators the constraints which affect their company's or agency's collaboration or cooperation in education, and to point out how educators can make these efforts more certain and productive. Emphasize that there will be an open exchange of views about the cooperation and possible collaboration of educators, employers, and community members. Say that you anticipate that all differences will not be resolved, but the openness in dealing with problems will stimulate participants to work more closely together in the future.

On your panel, for diversity, try to include a representative of the State Employment Service and a representative of a volunteer group such as the United Way, Boy or Girl Scouts, YWCA, YMCA, etc. Have the panelists and cadre read Attachment 2 and skim Hoyt, K. B., Community Resources for Career Education. Invite them to refer to either in their presentation.

LEARNER OBJECTIVES

Cadre will:

1. Report a greater willingness to show teachers how to integrate community resources into their classroom teaching.

2. Identify the ways in which the business/industry, labor, government, and volunteer sectors of the community are willing to contribute to career education and the contributions which require further exploration or negotiation.

3. Know the characteristics which employers believe are important for job entry and advancement.

4. Identify the actions which the non-school sector expects school officials to take in integrating non-school contributions into the career education program.

5. Increase by at least two the number of their community contacts for career education programs.

Community resource panel members will:

1. Know the kinds of assistance in career education infusion which educators believe are needed.

2. Know the constraints faced by educators when integrating community resources into classroom teaching.

Activity

Designate your community resource representatives as a panel. Introduce the panelists and tell the cadre that each representative will describe his or her company's or agency's career education services. Ask the cadre to delay their questions until every panelist completes his or her presentation.

Summarize the contents of "Community Involvement in Career Education" (Attachment 2). Ask a volunteer to clarify the concept of career education infusion for the panel and invite the panelists to ask any questions they have about the concept as defined by the cadre or in the letter of invitation.

Following the panel presentations, invite participant questions. Moderate the exchange to insure full panel participation. During the course of questions, encourage multiple panel members to answer a question.

Usually, the following issues will be raised, but you should have questions ready to elicit them if they are not raised.

1. Can the individual teacher or counselor contact your agency or business directly, and what is the best way to make contact?

2. What materials and personnel will your company/agency provide? Insure that the following are mentioned: mock-ups, speeches, tours, demonstration, 3-4 day employee loan, work (paid work experience for teachers, experience site for students).

3. What mechanism is available for the educator to use in giving constructive feedback on the performance of a representative of your company or agency?

4. What coordination or preparation by the school does your agency or business expect?

5. Can you give examples of how your institution is willing to help inservice teachers here in _____ (summer/part-time work, speaker, tour)?

6. What student characteristics make a difference in hiring and promotion in your company? (Elicit answers about: occupational skills, work habits, general communication, interpersonal.)

7. Career education infusion is trying to increase student self-awareness, occupational awareness, and decision-making ability. How will improvements in these areas help employees in your firm? (Probe such areas as: in selecting right job, in satisfaction, in self-improvement?)

8. What activities or job skills in your company could be "infused" with regular high school subjects?

9. What do you think of infusion as a direction and how can your particular company/agency help the schools with infusion?

After the questioning of the panel, and if it has not already been covered, tell the panel that educators typically have certain needs for assistance in career education but frequently do not know the community's receptivity to furnishing such help or the feasibility of such help. Say that you would like teachers to discuss the kinds of community help they need in order to obtain the advice of the panelists about securing it. Follow this by noting that there are constraints which prevent educators from interfacing more with the community. Have volunteers identify a few, so that panelists and cadre can suggest means of eliminating the constraints or of working within those which defy elimination. Among the possible constraints are: (1) a regulation which mandates that a class must always be supervised by a certificated person; (2) inability to schedule formal classes on weekends or evenings; and (3) inability to compensate teachers for collaboration activities.